Daily Report

Soviet Union

FBIS-SOV-90-088
Monday
7 May 1990

Daily Report
Soviet Union

FBIS-SOV-90-088 *7 May 1990*

CONTENTS

NOTICE TO READERS: An * indicates material not disseminated in electronic form.

ARMS CONTROL & DISARMAMENT

UK Paper Cited on Plans for New Missiles *[IZVESTIYA 5 May]* 1
U.S. Decision on Tactical Weapons 'Positive' *[Solton on Moscow International]* 1
2d Round of 'Open Skies' Conference Viewed *[Solovyev on Moscow International]* 1

WORLDWIDE ISSUES

'Two Plus Four' Talks Held in West Germany 2
Talks in Bonn Previewed *[PRAVDA 4 May]* 2
Shevardnadze Speaks on Arrival *[TASS]* 2
Shevardnadze Meets Kohl, Genscher *[TASS]* 3
'Vremya' Reports on Talks *[Moscow TV]* 3
Shevardnadze Meets With Baker *[TASS]* 4
United Germany in NATO Discussed *[Moscow Radio]* 4
Shevardnadze Departs for Moscow *[TASS]* 4
Shevardnadze Delivers Speech *[IZVESTIYA 7 May]* 5
Talks Reviewed *[TASS]* 9
Shevardnadze Interviewed *[Moscow TV]* 9
Participants Answer Questions *[TASS]* 10
Participants Give News Briefing *[TASS]* 11
Shevardnadze, Baker View Talks *[TASS]* 12
Achievements Cited *[IZVESTIYA 7 May]* 13
'Dynamic Start' Noted *[Grigoryev in PRAVDA 7 May]* 14
Genscher Interviewed *[Moscow TV]* 14
NATO Council Session Held in Brussels 15
Woerner Briefs Journalists *[IZVESTIYA 5 May]* 15
'Closer to Reality' on Some Issues *[PRAVDA 5 May]* 15

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

United States & Canada

Moscow TV Reports Prunskiene's Washington Visit 17
'Activation of Military' in USSR Worries Bush *[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 6 May]* 17
Bush 3 May White House News Conference Reported *[IZVESTIYA 5 May]* 18
Bush Comments on Lithuania *[TRUD]* 18
TASS on Bush Commencement Speech on NATO 19
CIA Shifts Emphasis to 'Secret Operations' *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 4 May]* 20

China

Taipei Students Demonstrate Against Decision *[Moscow International]* 22
Journalist Morozov Recounts Li Peng Interview *[ZA RUBEZHOM No 14]* 22
Shchedrov Comments on Li Peng's USSR Visit *[Moscow International]* 23
Soviet, Chinese Science Academies To Cooperate *[Moscow International]* 23

Northeast Asia

Government-Opposition Talks Open in Mongolia *[TASS]* 24
Remarks by Japanese Defense Chief Criticized *[TASS]* 24

Ecological Cooperation for Kurils Proposed *[Moscow International]* 25
Joint Venture To Assemble Mazda Cars in USSR *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 4 May]* 25
USSR's Nenashev Meets With NHK President *[Moscow International]* 26
ROK-Japanese Foreign Ministers Talks Viewed *[Moscow International]* 26
WPK Visitors Hold Talks at CPSU Departments *[PRAVDA 4 May]* 26
Yazov Greets O Chin-u on Army Anniversary *[Moscow International]* 26
Soviet Veteran Recalls 1958 in Korea *[Moscow International]* 26

Southeast Asia & Pacific

Sihanouk's Resignation as Army Commander Viewed *[Moscow International]* 28
Upcoming Hun Sen-Sihanouk Tokyo Talks Previewed *[Moscow International]* 28
Rogachev, Australian Ambassador Discuss Cambodia *[IZVESTIYA 29 Apr]* 29

Near East & South Asia

PLO's Mahmud Abbas Cited on Visit to USSR *[RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA 2 May]* 29
TASS Previews Mubarak Visit to Soviet Union 30
Petrovskiy, Iranian Envoy Discuss Regional Issues *[TASS]* 31
Commentary Notes Iran's Reaction to 'Iraqgate' *[Radio Peace and Progress]* 31
Iranian, Iraqi Search for Enemies Criticized *[Radio Peace and Progress]* 31
Commentary Examines Bottleneck at Oil Terminals *[Moscow International]* 32
Delegation Discusses POWs With Najibullah *[TASS]* 32
Soviet Role in Mideast Arms Proliferation Viewed *[MOSCOW NEWS No 17]* 32

East Europe

Soviets Protest CSFR Demonstrators' Blockade *[TASS]* 33
Moldavian-Romanian Friendship Festival Held *[Moscow TV]* 33
Romanian State Security Service Reorganized *[IZVESTIYA 4 May]* 33
Gorbachev, Bulgarian President Talk on Phone *[TASS]* 34
Southern Forces Chief on Withdrawal Problems *[PRAVDA 5 May]* 35
Soviet Troops in GDR Assigned New Tasks *[Hamburg DER SPIEGEL 30 Apr]* 35
Soviet Admission on Katyn Massacre Viewed *[IZVESTIYA 15 Apr]* 36

West Europe

Lithuania's Prunskiene To Visit UK 8-9 May *[Moscow International]* 38
Yeltsin on Independence for Baltic Republics *[Madrid Radio]* 38
Yeltsin Leaves for Moscow *[AFP]* 38
FRG Republicans Advocate 'Greater Germany' *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 13 Apr]* 38
IZVESTIYA Interviews Spanish Bank President *[3 May]* 39
TV To Show Film on Kim Philby 11 May *[TASS]* 40

Latin America & Caribbean

Supreme Soviet Delegation Continues Cuba Visit 41
More on Baklanov Arrival Statement *[IZVESITYA 5 May]* 41
Delegation Visits National Assembly *[TASS]* 41
Baklanov Meets Fidel Castro *[TASS]* 42
Cuban Ambassador to Moscow Balaguer Interviewed *[Moscow International]* 42
Radio Program Views Soviet-Cuban Relations *[Moscow International]* 43

NATIONAL AFFAIRS

Political & Social

PRAVDA Festival Under Way, Gorbachev Attends *[Moscow Radio]* 44
Frolov Opens Proceedings *[TASS]* 44
Frolov on Festival's Aims *[Moscow Radio]* 44
Gorbachev Greets Participants, Guests *[PRAVDA 5 May]* 44

Gorbachev Interviewed at Festival *[Moscow TV]* 45
Gorbachev Calls for 'Democratic' PRAVDA *[PRAVDA 6 May]* 45
Ligachev at Discussion Session *[PRAVDA 6 May]* 46
Second Day of Festival Noted *[PRAVDA 7 May]* 47
PRAVDA Editor in Chief Interview *[Moscow TV]* 47
Gorbachev Opens Victory Anniversary Meeting *[Moscow Radio]* 47
Addresses Participants 47
Law on Division of Powers Published *[IZVESTIYA 4 May]* 48
More on Yakovlev News Conference Remarks *[PRAVDA 5 May]* 50
Yakovlev Discusses Extremists at INTERFAX Club *[Moscow TV]* 51
INTERFAX News Agency Profiled *[Moscow Radio]* 52
Yakovlev, Sagalayev on Media Freedom *[Moscow TV]* 53
Bakatin Deplores May Day 'Hooliganism' *[Moscow TV]* 54
May Day Demonstrations Analyzed *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 4 May]* 55
Dangers of Extreme Radicalism Indicated *[IZVESTIYA 4 May]* 56
Politburo Discusses 28th Congress Preparations *[TASS]* 57
No Evidence Found Involving Gorbachev With 'Mafia' *[TASS]* 57
Patriarch Pimen Dies in Moscow 3 May 58
Gorbachev Sends Condolences *[TASS]* 58
Lukyanov Expresses Sorrow *[TASS]* 58
Council of Ministers Note *[TASS]* 58
Gorbachev Awards Order of Peoples' Friendship *[Moscow Radio]* 58
Poll Reveals Dissatisfaction With Reform *[TASS]* 58
'Top Priority' Discusses Party Structure *[Moscow International]* 58
Ryzhkov, Ligachev Address Oil Conference *[PRAVDA 24 Apr]* 62
Democratic Platform Members Oppose Party Split *[Moscow International]* 63
Trade Union Congress Adopts Program *[TASS]* 63
AUCCTU Chief Urges Action, Reform *[TRUD 18 Apr]* 63
Russian Official Calls for Migration Service *[TASS]* 71
Inaccurate Moscow Crime Statistics Revealed *[TRUD 12 Mar]* 71
New Financial Newspaper Launched in USSR *[Moscow TV]* 73
MOSCOW MAGAZINE To Appear in May *[TASS]* 73

Economic

Scope, Impact of Price Reform Discussed *[PRAVDA 13 Apr]* 74
Nikitin Reviews 1st Quarter Economic Performance
[PRAVITELSTVENNYY VESTNIK No 15] 75
Need for Accelerating Reforms Analyzed *[PRAVDA 16 Apr]* 78

Agricultural

Crop Sowing Statistics, Supply Situation Reported *[Moscow Radio]* 80
Agricultural Developments for 30 April-5 May *[Moscow Radio]* 80

Scientific

'Progress-42' Cargo Ship Launched *[TASS]* 80
Docking With Station Set for 7 May *[Moscow Radio]* 81
Features of 'Mir' Station Technology Module *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 4 Apr]* 81
Earth Tremors Registered in Kirghizia *[TASS]* 82

Military

Omelichev Interviewed on Call-Up Status *[Moscow TV]* 82
Defense Chief Denies Spring Draft Postponed *[Moscow TV]* 84
Military Official Cited on Army Spring Call-Up *[Moscow Radio]* 84

REGIONAL AFFAIRS

Baltic Republics

Baltic States To Hold High-Level Consultations *[Vilnius International]* 85
Yakovlev Urges Moscow-Lithuanian Dialogue *[Moscow Radio]* 85
Soviet Army Rehearses for Parade in Vilnius *[AFP]* 85
Possible Resumption of Gas Supplies Reported *[Vilnius Radio]* 86
Vilnius Radio Carries 4 May Supreme Council 86
Moscow Delegation Debated 86
Antiblockade Efforts Viewed 86
Political Situation Debated 87
Brazauskas Discusses Effects of Blockade *[Vilnius Radio]* 87
More on Blockade *[Vilnius International]* 88
Number of Lithuanian Unemployed Remains Stable *[Vilnius International]* 89
Blockade Leads To Shortened Broadcast Day *[Vilnius Radio]* 89
Lithuania's Economic Problems, Measures Detailed *[Moscow Radio]* 90
Antiblockade Commission Issues Supply Proposals *[Vilnius Radio]* 91
Lithuanian Communique on Economic Situation *[Vilnius Radio]* 91
Construction Concentrating on Housing, Social *[Vilnius Radio]* 91
Union Bank Halts Foreign Currency Transactions *[Vilnius Radio]* 91
Deputy Says Western Support 'Not Decisive' *[Vilnius International]* 91
Soviet Commander Concerned About Border Situation *[Warsaw TV]* 92
Landsbergis Sends Greetings to Latvia *[Vilnus Radio]* 92
Lithuanian Trade Minister on U.S., Canada Talks *[Vilnius International]* 92
Report on Lithuanian 'Union of Riflemen' Group *[Moscow TV]* 93
Estonian Official Presents Credentials in Vilnius *[Vilnius Radio]* 93
Remarks on Aid *[Vilnius International]* 93
Savisaar, Military Official Discuss Militia *[Tallinn Radio]* 94
Minister Urges Ethnic Reconciliation in Estonia *[TASS]* 94
Deputy on Estonian Supreme Soviet Progress *[Tallinn Radio]* 95
Latvian Parliament Adopts Message to Gorbachev *[TASS]* 95
Latvian Parliament Expected To Elect Premier *[TASS]* 96
Ivans Comments on Latvian Independence Declaration *[AFP]* 96
Rubiks on Gorbachev Opposition to Declaration *[TASS]* 96
More on Gorbachev View *[TASS]* 96
Gorbunov on Latvian Declaration, Dialogue *[Moscow TV]* 97
Latvian 4 May Supreme Soviet Session Concludes *[Riga Radio]* 98
Relations With USSR Viewed 98
Draft Declaration Debated 98
Independence Declaration Adopted 99
Gorbunov Closes Session 99
Latvian Declaration of Independence Issued *[Riga Radio]* 99
Further on Declaration *[AFP]* 101
TASS Reports on 4 May Latvian Supreme Soviet 101
Moscow TV Inteviews Gorbunov on Independence 102
Gorbunov Addresses Latvian Supreme Soviet 3 May *[Riga Radio]* 102
Gorbunov Remarks to Latvian Deputies Cited *[IZVESTIYA 5 May]* 104

RSFSR

Russian Social Democrats Hold Inaugural Congress *[TASS]* 105
Draft Rules Debated *[TASS]* 105
Party Rules Adopted *[TASS]* 106
More on Congress *[Moscow Radio]* 106
Moscow Soviet To Discuss City Status Draft Law *[IZVESTIYA 3 May]* 106
Tyumen Oil Restricted to Contract Customers *[Moscow Radio]* 107
Tomsk Nuclear Plant Blamed for Contamination *[IZVESTIYA 4 May]* 107
Fire Breaks Out on Siberian Gas Pipeline *[TASS]* 108
Ostakino TV Center To Increase Capabilites *[Moscow International]* 108

Western Republics

Plan To Decommission Chernobyl, Aid Victims *[IZVESTIYA 28 Apr]* 108
Ceremonies Commemorating Chernobyl Disaster Noted *[IZVESTIYA 28 Apr]* 110
Chernobyl Union Formed in Chernigov *[PRAVDA UKRAINY 22 Mar]* 111
Ivashko on Ukrainian Withdrawal From Union *[RADYANSKA UKRAINA 1 May]* 111
Ivashko Has Meeting With Swedish Ambassador *[Kiev Radio]* 111
Ukrainian Party Official Interviewed on May Day *[Kiev International]* 112
One Dead, 20 Injured in Ukraine Rail Crash *[Moscow Radio]* 112
Belorussian Supreme Soviet Elections Reviewed *[Moscow Radio]* 112
Moldavian-Romanian Cultural Event on Border *[TASS]* 113
Komratskiy Rayon First Secretary Replaced *[SOVETSKAYA MOLDAVIYA 10 Apr]* 113

Caucasus

Nagorno-Karabakh Situation 'Remains Tense' *[Baku Radio]* 113
Armed Group Attacks Yerevan Party Building *[Yerevan Radio]* 113
Armenian Plenum To Discuss Weapons Incident *[Moscow Radio]* 113
More on Plenum *[Yerevan Radio]* 114
Militia Attacked; Arms, Ammunition Stolen *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 6 May]* 114
Report on Armenian Supreme Soviet Session *[Yerevan Radio]* 114
Spring Draft Suspended *[ARMENPRES]* 116
Border Area Discussed *[PRAVDA 4 May]* 117
General Criticizes Armenian Decision on Draftees *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 6 May]* 117
Transcaucasus Railways Returning to Normal *[Moscow TV]* 117
Strikers Force Railway Chief's Resignation *[ZARYA VOSTOKA 24 Apr]* 118

Central Asia

Turkmen Foreign Ministry Activities Examined *[Ashkhabad Radio]* 118
Rybazov Dismissed From Turkmenistan Committee
[SOVET TURKMENISTANY 26 Apr] 119
No-Show by Soccer Team Sparks Andizhan Riots *[PRAVDA 4 May]* 119
Rain, Mud Slides Cause Damage in Tajikistan *[Moscow TV]* 119
List of Tajik Council of Ministers Published *[KOMMUNIST TADZHIKISTANA 24 Apr]* 120
Kazakhstan Expands Cooperation With Japanese Firm *[Moscow Radio]* 120
Peace Committee Urges Closure of Test Site *[TASS]* 121
Nazarbayev Attends Kazakhstan Party Conference *[Moscow Radio]* 121
Floods Damage Guryev Area; Kill Livestock *[Moscow TV]* 121
Kazakh Oblast Conferences Elect Leaders *[Moscow Radio]* 121
Guryev Obkom First Secretary Released *[Alma-Ata Radio]* 121

UK Paper Cited on Plans for New Missiles

PM0405152890 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 5 May 90 Morning Edition p 4

[TASS report under general heading: "Outlines of a Future Europe"]

[Text] London, 3 May—THE U.S. Air Force, the GUARDIAN newspaper reports today, has begun preparing military bases on the territory of West European countries and Turkey for siting the new generation of tactical nuclear missiles of the "air-to-surface" class. These missiles, the newspaper notes, "will be mounted on planes able to reach deep inside the Soviet Union." Work should be completed by the end of next year on preparations for the siting of 389 new tactical nuclear missiles in Belgium, Greece, Britain, Italy, the Netherlands, the FRG, and Turkey. It is planned to deploy 126 of these weapons on British territory, at the bases at Lakenheath, Upper Heyford, and Bentwaters.

The new tactical nuclear systems, according to THE GUARDIAN, are to replace the Lance missile and 4,000 artillery shells. They will have a range of 400 km, but taking into account the range of the aircraft on which they will be mounted, the missiles could hit targets in Soviet territory. And THE GUARDIAN notes that the Pentagon is already engaged in development work to increase the new tactical missile's range to nearly 1,000 km, which, for instance, will enable planes based in Britain to strike at industrial targets in the Soviet Union beyond the Urals. Thus aircraft equipped with these nuclear systems, the newspaper concludes, are almost indistinguishable in practice from strategic weapons, and are a substitute for the medium-range nuclear missiles destroyed under the Soviet-American Treaty on the Elimination of Intermediate- and Shorter-Range Missiles.

U.S. Decision on Tactical Weapons 'Positive'

LD0405200790 Moscow World Service in English 1110 GMT 4 May 90

[Commentary by Yuriy Solton—read by announcer]

[Text] As you may have heard in the news, the United States will not modernize its tactical nuclear weapons intended fo. West Europe and give up the planned deployment of the more powerful Lance tactical missiles there. President George Bush said as much last Thursday. Yuriy Solton comments:

The American decision definitely recognizes the irreversible changes in Europe. It has been welcomed in the other NATO countries. They objected to tactical nuclear weapons modernization before. The decision has drawn positive response from Moscow. You may know the Soviet Union and its Warsaw Treaty partners have been pressing to rid Europe of all nuclear weapons. This country is unilaterally withdrawing 500 units of tactical nuclear ammunition from East Europe. President Bush, however, did not say whether the United States is going to reciprocate.

The Americans admit they have 3,500 tactical nuclear warheads in West Europe, to say nothing of the British and French. President Bush says the Lance missiles and nuclear artillery shells will not be modernized but makes no mention of the American wish to bring more systems of tactical nuclear weapons to West Europe. The United States Air Force is reported to have begun to prepare bases in Britain and some other West European nations to accommodate 450 air-to-ground nuclear missiles. These will be supplied to aircraft capable of going into the depths of Soviet territory. Besides, 350 tactical nuclear missiles have reportedly gone to American submarines in the North Atlantic and the Mediterranean.

As can be seen, America is restructuring its tactical nuclear forces in West Europe. Is this an excuse for the non- modernization and non-deployment of ground-based nuclear missiles and artillery nuclear shells in this part of Europe?

The American administration has adopted one more far-reaching decision, to negotiate tactical nuclear arms with this country as soon as an agreement on cuts on conventional armed forces in Europe is signed. Washington used to hugger-mugger the date of the talks; it used to condition the date on how the conventional weapons reduction would go. Some are predicting difficult talks. The Helsinki process of more trust and cooperation in Europe is gaining momentum, and Soviet-American summit talks will get under way at the end of this month. Let's hope all this will help gradually scale down and ultimately scrap tactical nuclear arms in Europe.

2d Round of 'Open Skies' Conference Viewed

LD0605143890 Moscow World Service in English 1110 GMT 6 May 90

[Commentary by military observer Colonel Vadim Solovyev—read by announcer]

[Text] The second round of the international Open Skies conference ends in Budapest next Saturday. Warsaw Pact and NATO representatives have been discussing draft accords that will allow the countries involved in the negotiations to exercise unarmed air surveillance of their military activity. Agreement was reached in principle at the first stage of the conference in Ottawa last February, but can something concrete be expected in Budapest? The view of our military observer, Colonel Vadim Solovyev:

To put the agreement that has been reached in principle into effect has proved a rather hard matter. The first stage of the conference inspired certainty that the establishment of an open skies regime was feasible. It appeared that the purely technical and procedural issues that remained for the second stage in Budapest would be resolved. And indeed, compromise solutions have been found to some (?of its) questions, even though all the agenda issues will hardly be settled. Particularly complex have been the matters related to the exchange of data received through inspection flights, and some other problems.

There's little time left to cope with the unresolved issues, but what arouses optimism is that negotiations are being put on a high level, with foreign ministers taking part. What is most important is that there is certainty that the practical goal of the conference is feasible.

'Two Plus Four' Talks Held in West Germany

Talks in Bonn Previewed

PM0405095390 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 4 May 90 Second Edition pp 5, 7

[Yevgeniy Grigoryev dispatch: "Before the Berlin (as published) 'Trial Run'"]

[Text] Bonn, 3 May—The meeting of the "Two Plus Four" group is expected with interest in Bonn. The first meeting at the level of foreign ministers will take place 5 May. As is well known, this special forum of the USSR, United States, France, and Great Britain on the one hand and the GDR and the FRG on the other hand will be called upon to settle the external aspects of building German unity, including security questions. At issue is the military-political status of the future united Germany, the definitive recognition of the borders under international law, and much else.

Judging by appearances, the greatest difficulty is presented by the question of the future military-political status of a united Germany. The United States, France, Great Britain, and the FRG are advocating that it become part of the NATO bloc. The new GDR Government also favors this solution as a temporary measure until all-European security structures have been created, and with a number of provisos and conditions pertaining to changes in the strategy of the North Atlantic alliance. As is well known, the Soviet Union rejects the formula "the whole of Germany into NATO," and it has sufficiently weighty reasons for this.

So what is to be done? People in Bonn are not making a stumbling block out of this problem. They are saying that this is a soluble problem and they are proposing to resolve it by making amendments to NATO strategy and taking steps toward the establishment of new all-European structures. However, ultimately the aim is the selfsame membership of a united Germany in NATO. They merely trying to make it "palatable" to the USSR and to enable Moscow to "save face," so to speak. Meanwhile the NATO bloc has been and remains a military alliance spearheaded against our country.

FRG Defense Minister G. Stoltenberg, who is currently visiting the United States, has said there that nuclear weapons must be retained on the territory of his country also in the future. There may be fewer of them and their presence may not be described as a "deterrent" but rather as some kind of "guarantee of the reciprocal security treaty system."

Furthermore, NATO military circles are turning their eyes toward new nuclear systems. According to SUEDDEUTSCHE ZEITUNG today, Washington and London are seeking to achieve "as soon as possible an accord in favor of new air-launched nuclear missiles capable of reaching targets in the European part of the USSR." It is proposed to use F-15E, F-16, and F-111 U.S. fighter-bombers and also the West European Tornado as delivery vehicles. A substantial proportion of these weapons would be based in Germany, the newspaper reports.

If we proceed from the real security interests of all the partners, the one-sided formulas on the lines of "Germany into NATO" can hardly be viewed as acceptable. Life itself demands a quest for unorthodox solutions and fundamentally new approaches. One such solution that has been mentioned is the simultaneous German membership of NATO and the Warsaw Pact. A controversy rages around this idea. Some people here reject it as infeasible, while others see a "grain of truth" in it.

"Despite the scepticism," KOELNER STADT-ANZEIGER, for instance, writes today, "such dual membership is entirely feasible provided that both alliances radically change their strategy and move on from deterrence to collective defense. Is this is not keeping with our dream of the common home for Europe? Germany, in this case, would be the linking element between the two formerly hostile parts of Europe, that is, it would play a genuine peacemaking role."

The session of the "Two Plus Four" group in Bonn will be a kind of "trial run," a first opportunity to compare ideas, approaches, and proposals regarding the external aspects of building German unity.

Shevardnadze Speaks on Arrival

LD0405145690 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1310 GMT 4 May 90

[Text] Bonn, 4 May (TASS)—Eduard Shevardnadze, CPSU Central Committee Politburo member and USSR foreign minister, has arrived here to take part in the talks on the external aspects of German unity. At Cologne-Bonn airport, he was met by senior FRG Foreign Ministry officials, USSR ambassador in the FRG Yuliy Kvitsinskiy, and other officials.

E.A. Shevardnadze will take part in the talks that are to begin on 5 May according to the "two-plus-four" formula. At the talks, the foreign ministers of the FRG, GDR, France, Great Britain, the USSR, and the United States will discuss foreign political problems connected with the unification of the two German states.

At the airport E.A. Shevardnadze answered questions from journalists about the meeting of the foreign ministers of six states, which is to take place tomorrow, and noted that it is a question of solving problems connected with the reunification of Germany. This is a historic event and in connection with this the role of tomorrow's meeting is enhanced, the minister stated. I don't think any final decisions will be adopted there, he added. The ministers will set forth their governments' positions on the external aspects of the construction of German unity. The Soviet leadership's view is that the process of German reunification must be synchronized with the creation of pan-European security structures.

The Soviet minister continued that in the next few days all of mankind will celebrate the anniversary of the victory over fascism. This is further grounds for approaching with complete responsibility the solution of today's complex tasks.

E.A. Shevardnadze rejected the idea of united Germany's membership in NATO. He stressed that the USSR would like it to be a factor for order and stability in Europe. In his opinion such a Germany must be a united free state that would not need any additional control mechanisms on the part of the military-political blocs. We trust the German people, the minister stressed. He expressed hope that the forthcoming meeting of "the Six" will be held in a businesslike and constructive atmosphere and in the spirit of cooperation and mutual respect.

Shevardnadze Meets Kohl, Genscher

LD0405193290 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1741 GMT 4 May 90

[Text] Bonn, 4 May (TASS)—E.A. Shevardnadze, the USSR minister of foreign affairs who arrived here to take part in the first meeting of the ministers of foreign affairs within the framework of the "Two Plus Four" mechanism, had a one and one-half hour conversation with H. Kohl, the FRG federal chancellor. The meeting opens tomorrow. Attention was devoted mainly to the discussion, in principle, of prospects for the development of mutually advantageous, bilateral relations and cooperation, under the new conditions which have taken shape in Europe and the world. In particular, this took into account the construction of German unity. The conversation was constructive.

At the meeting which then took place between E.A. Shevardnadze and H.D. Genscher, the FRG minister of foreign affairs, a thorough exchange of opinions was held on German affairs, with the stress on military-political status, the synchronization of unification with the CSCE process, and the creation of new security structures in Europe. From the Soviet side, the necessity for an all-around approach toward the external aspects of the construction of German unity was stressed, which would best guarantee a balance of interests for everyone.

E.A. Shevardnadze confirmed the unacceptability—for the Soviet Union—of the inclusion of a united Germany in NATO, which would lead to a break in the balance of forces which have taken shape on the continent. The Soviet Union is in favor of a joint search for such answers, which would take into account the interests of all sides—including Europe as a whole—in equal measure. These interests, however, demand the urgent creation of new pan-European security structures, in which the future Germany will occupy a place that befits it.

'Vremya' Reports on Talks

LD0405205790 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1700 GMT 4 May 90

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] [Announcer] Comrade Shevardnadze arrived in Bonn today, where he is to take part in a meeting by the foreign ministers of six states—the USSR, the United States, Great Britain, France, the GDR, and the FRG. The meeting will discuss the external aspects of the construction of German unity. A report from our correspondent:

[Kondratyev] The journalists in Bonn had a hard assignment. They were warned that there would be no interviews or press statements at the airport. Just 20 minutes before the aircraft arrived from Moscow, Baker was met here—all strictly according to protocol. But the Soviet minister went over to the correspondents. True, at first, when he learned that Baker had said nothing, he, too, wanted to avoid any conversation. But journalistic persistence won out. Naturally, the main thing they wanted to hear about was: Can a unified Germany be in NATO?

[Begin Shevardnadze recording] No, no. We see a unified Germany as a very important factor for stability and tranquility in Europe. Membership in any single bloc for a giant like Germany, with its enormous potential—its scientific, technological, industrial, and intellectual potential...I do not think that would create the conditions for stability. I believe there is no need for any additional control mechanisms on the part of the military blocs. We trust the German people. [end recording]

[Kondratyev] Today, the reality of the situation is that, for our country's Western counterparts at the talks, the question of Germany's membership in NATO is not really considered to be a topic for discussion. Bonn and the other capitals hope that the Soviet Union has not yet delivered its final word. The meeting with the chancellor was not originally planned. Helmut Kohl is one of the firmest opponents of Germany developing independently outside NATO, although the FRG does recognize the legitimacy of the Soviet Union's security interests. The West Germans imagine that a review of NATO's military strategy and a certain reduction in the West's troops and armaments can make our country more amenable. Much attention is being devoted today in the FRG to the U.S. decision not to modernize the Lance missiles and the nuclear artillery on the continent. There is no attempt here to conceal that fact that by so doing the West wants to sugar the pill of the GDR being openly drawn into NATO. At his meeting with his U.S. counterpart, Comrade Shevardnadze responded approvingly to the United States' long-overdue disarmament step. The Soviet Union has long been insisting on this.

The bilateral consultations between the two before the start of the talks are in full swing. As this "Vremya" program is going on the air, our minister is meeting with Hans-Dietrich Genscher. It is in the building of his

department that the long-awaited high level negotiations will take place tomorrow. The talks, if they do not actually dot all the i's once and for all, will at least provide an opportunity to clarify how those people who are responsible for the formation of their countries' foreign policy see the future of Germany, and the future of East and West. [video shows Shevardnadze arriving and approaching the press groups; Shevardnadze interview; Shevardnadze-Kohl meeting; Shevardnadze-Baker meeting]

Shevardnadze Meets With Baker

LD0405214290 Moscow TASS in English 2117 GMT 4 May 90

[Text] Bonn May 5 TASS—Soviet Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze and U.S. Secretary of State James Baker met here and had a talk lasting about three hours. They compared the approaches of the sides to the tasks facing "the Six" and aimed at settling the external aspects of building German unity.

The discussion revealed both coinciding points and certain differences of evaluation regarding, specifically, the military and political status of a reunited Germany.

Shevardnadze and Baker considered the course of preparation of the forthcoming Soviet-U.S. summit in Washington. It was pointed out in this connection that it was important to make utmost use of the U.S. secretary of state's forthcoming visit to Moscow in mid-May.

They again reaffirmed the sides' intent to achieve tangible results during the summit, specifically, as regards reductions of strategic arms, the elimination of chemical arms as well as in other fields.

The situation concerning Lithuania was also touched upon. The two sides emphasised the need to look for a solution through dialogue. Shevardnadze and Baker believe that their meeting in Bonn proved useful and substantive, enabling them to outline in bold relief such an epoch-making event in Soviet-American relations as President Mikhail Gorbachev's visit to the United States.

United Germany in NATO Discussed

LD0505150890 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1230 GMT 5 May 90

[Report from Bonn by station correspondent Aleksandr Pozharskiy]

[Text] The first meeting under the "Two Plus Four" formula of the foreign ministers of the FRG, GDR, and the four victorious World War II powers is taking place in Bonn. Its participants are discussing issues connected with the unification of the two German states. Just a moment ago we received this report from our correspondent in Bonn Aleksandr Pozharskiy.

[Pozharskiy] Yesterday, the day of the ministers' arrival in the West German capital, was filled with working meetings and preliminary talks. Eduard Amvrosiyevich Shevardnadze met James Baker, his U.S. colleague, and FRG Chancellor Helmut Kohl. The official talks are being held at the FRG Ministry of Foreign Affairs practically for the whole day today. Even the dinner is organized in such a way so as not to interrupt the flow of discussion. The foreign ministers are discussing first of all the aspects of security connected with the appearance of a single power German state in the center of Europe. One of these problems—I think the most complex one—is the relationship between a future united Germany and the military-political blocs. As you know, NATO, above all the United States, is insisting on the membership of a united Germany in this military-political alliance. The Soviet Union believes that if Germany is kept in NATO this will considerably upset the balance of forces between East and West, and therefore proposes to take the path of a demilitarizaiton of Germany by giving it the status of neutrality or, for example, restricting its membership to just the political structure of NATO. Of course, it is difficult to foresee which way this problem will be solved.

Now the local political observers are busy trying to draw up various compromise variants. As a condition of Germany's remaining in NATO is is suggested, for example, that it give up the possession of nuclear, chemical, and bacteriological weapons forever. It is also proposed to eliminate all short-range nuclear missiles in Europe. At the same time, the U.S. suggestion to eliminate these missiles on FRG territory is proclaimed to be a most important step toward the unification of Germany. One must say that by proclaiming the so-called U.S. initiative for the elimination of this type of missile, they are trying not to mention here that Washington intends to replace them by air-launched missiles that can reach Moscow. Further, as a compensation for Germany's membership in NATO is is proposed to preserve all trade and economic relations of the GDR and the Soviet Union, though the question of the grounds for their liquidation arises.

While insisting on Germany's NATO membership—FRG political circles are talking of the need for the transformations of the bloc's functions and imparting to them a political nature of the blocs—the FRG's exit from the military organization of NATO could be an answer to the GDR's exit from the Warsaw Pact organization.

Shevardnadze Departs for Moscow

LD0505172790 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1714 GMT 5 May 90

[Text] Bonn, 5 May (TASS)—Eduard Shevardnadze, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo USSR minister of foreign affairs, left for Moscow today after taking part in the "Two Plus Four" formula talks which took place here.

He was seen off at Cologne-Bonn airport by senior officials of the FRG Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Yuliy Kvitsinskiy, USSR ambassador in the FRG, and other officials.

Shevardnadze Delivers Speech

PM0705092990 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 7 May 90 Morning Edition p 3

[Text] Respected colleagues!

At the first meeting of such historical significance and of such responsibility as ours, it is, in my view, impossible to manage without an exposition of one's point of view on the problem which we are discussing and on which we must come to agreement.

Allow me to begin with what in our view lies at the basis of everything, that is: with the logic, philosophy, and psychology of our approach toward German affairs. If we understand one another on these levels then this will help us to find mutual understanding on specific issues and on political positions. Let me stress first and foremost that for the Soviet Union relations with Germany are a central and special issue in its history. It has come about that the German angle has long loomed extremely large in the Soviet people's national memory, in its perception of the surrounding world and its ideas about the challenges of the times, and in its psychology.

We have not previously had—nor, fortunately, have we now acquired—any allergy to the German people's striving for unity. We back the Germans' right to self-determination. We believe that a united Germany will become a member of the family of European peoples as a democratic peaceloving state aware of its responsibilities and its obligations to maintain international peace and security.

Our conviction in this respect is bolstered by what we know of the world outlook of the new generations of Germans and of their aspirations and aims in life.

We have no grounds or reasons for doubting their love of peace or their commitment to universal human and humanistic values. The worst thing we should do would be to base ourselves on stereotypes and ideas which have had their day. We feel that there can be no question today of any kind of discrimination against the Germans—juridical or psychological.

Both mutual respect and mutual confidence grew out of postwar cooperation. Today we have good, businesslike, and in many respects friendly relations both with our ally, the GDR, and with the member of the other alliance, the FRG. There is every reason to believe that we will be able to speak one language when proceeding to tackle the major tasks before us.

We are to jointly formulate a political, legal, and material model which will not break down under any conditions in the future. We not only must exclude the possibility of a repetition of the past, but also must make sure that the shadows of former fears also should not emerge.

Such a formulation of the task—and we can formulate it only in this way—implies that the variants which are being elaborated by us must endure the toughest of tests if, in defiance of reason, things come to that. And this implies that they must receive total support from our peoples, from the European and world public, and must become an important new factor in strengthening international confidence.

This is not a matter of mere apprehensions about some unforeseen and unfavorable development of the situation in Germany itself. The entire structure of the military and political confrontation, everything that we associate with the cold war period, in the postwar years became bound up with Germany, as a geographical concept. So, we are not talking about Germany alone, and are not resolving solely German problems.

The reality today, moreover, is such that the "connection of times was broken too much in many places in Europe, if one can borrow the term from Shakespeare.

Therefore, what is involved is emplacing in the German settlement very important elements for a pan-European settlement, finally overcoming the division of Europe, and formulating reliable guarantees which would durably provide for stability and security for decades ahead. It is impossible to reckon on this unless the German issue is placed organically into a broader European framework and unless the resolution of it is based on guarantees of a material nature in addition to the provisions of an international-legal character. Such an approach and such a vision of the problem are the necessary minimum for what can enable us to find an acceptable outcome.

We of course understand that a solution can only be the result of the common consent of all six states. However, it should be borne in mind that in tackling the external aspects of the unification of Germany, we cannot abstract ourselves from the domestic circumstances in our own country. We are dealing here with an issue of particular importance for Soviet people and for our entire society. If attempts are made to put us in a constrained situation in affairs affecting our security, then this will lead to a situation—I say this frankly—where the degree of our political flexibility will be severely restricted, for emotions will come to the boil within the country, spectres of the past will come to the fore, the national complexes rooted in the tragic pages of our history will be revived.

This is a fact of our real life, and it must be reckoned with. I shall say more—neither the current nor any other Soviet leadership will be able to neglect public opinion. The Soviet people should perceive that a line is being drawn beneath the past in a worthy and just manner.

I am speaking with the utmost honesty and frankness, I am designating the situation as it is, as we see the feel it.

Taking into consideration that our agenda—and, I would say, our lives—consist of a complex amalgam of difficult and sensitive problems, we belive that only a composite apoproach can be taken to their solution and that they can only be regarded as a single, interconnected whole.

It is our conviction that there can be nothing here other than a package approach. We propose the following as a guiding principle: That nothing has been agreed until all aspects of a settlement have been agreed and a total balance of interests, which is so essential in an undertaking of such a scale as a German settlement, has been found.

I should like to report to my colleagues that we shall be prepared to talk about a final international legal settlement as our goal, although we also continue to believe that it would be more correct to put the question of concluding a peace treaty. In this we are moving toward our partners.

In doing so we are proceeding from the premise that the elaboration of a single, integral document which would embace all aspects of a settlement should be the result of the work of "The Six."

It should contain provisions about Germany's borders. It should be created within the territory of the FRG, the GDR and Berlin—no more and no less than this. It should also include provisions on its armed forces, the military-political status of the new state, continuity of obligations, a transitional period and measures for this period, and the presence of military contingents of the allied powers on German territory.

In this connection we advocate the particpation of Poland in an examination of the issue of borders as well as security issues affecting Poland's interests. The current undertakings of the GDR and the FRG not to hold atomic, chemical, or other weapons of mass destruction must be confirmed in this document. There should be room in it, too, for a declaration that a united Germany will build its policy in such a way that only peace springs from its territory. It is also essential to include provisions ruling out the re-emergence of a Nazi political ideology and outlawing the activity of National Socialist Parties and movements. It goes without saying that Germany must not review or cast doubt on the legitimacy of the measures and decisions taken by the four powers in the occupied zones.

Returning to the question of its military-political status, I should like to reaffirm our negative attitude toward a united Germany's membership of NATO, for such a decision would very substantially affect our security interests, would mean the sudden breakdown in the correlation of forces in Europe, and would create a dangerous military-strategic situation for us.

As far as we are concerned, NATO remains the same as ever—an opposing military bloc with a doctrine which has a definite thrust and which takes the line that it could be the first to deliver a nuclear strike.

Yes, both we and you speak about the prospects for the transformation of the blocs. But when will this occur, and will it occur at all? No guarantees on this count have been produced yet.

And we have grounds for thinking that in drawing the new German state into NATO, people wish to perpetuate the existence of this military bloc in law.

Or is it a matter here of lack of trust in the Germans? Of fearing that in leaving them outside the bloc control over Germany will be lost?

Then let us decide this fundamental issue—how far our trust extends. in my view, if we trust the Germans then we must trust them completely.

Otherwise, we will, from the very beginning, be making a dangerous fissure in the German settlement and will move toward a new schism in Europe, toward a revival of opposition and confrontation. If we proceed from a different objective then we do not need to rely on blocs but on pan-European security structures which we need to create without losing time.

There is agreement on the need to turn to the construction of a "common European home." This is not a matter of terms. The idea of a common European home is also embodied in the formulas of a European confederation and in other proposals in this regard.

It is namely this which can become a guarantee of stability and security in Europe and open a road to the construction of a new, undivided, but cooperating, Europe.

Besides the purely military side, this variant is unacceptable for us for internal political reasons. The population of our country, having borne such terrible losses in the last war, irreconcilably regards the idea of including a united Germany in NATO. This has again been shown by an opinion poll which was recently carried out throughout the whole country. There are such moods in our Supreme Soviet as well. We cannot but take this into consideration.

I would ask colleagues to understand that we are neither playing nor bluffing here.

I therefore call for a joint search for other options taking into account not only our interests but the broad interests of European peace and global security.

In the course of my contacts with some partners in the "Six," I have formed the impression that there exists a calculation, an intention one way or another to reduce the whole problem of an ultimate peace settlement to termination of the quadripartite rights and responsibilities in relation to Germany and Berlin.

What is also needed here is clarity from the very beginning. In our view, termination of the quadripartite rights and responsibilities should be a component element and a result of an ultimate settlement, but only one of its elements, and a decision on it can be found only in conjunction with all the other elements.

As we see it, resolution of the internal and external aspects of German unity does not necessarily have to occur simultaneously, or be accomplished within one and the same transition period.

Even after the creation of one legislature and government in Germany, certain measures connected with the solution of external aspects of the settlement will obviously remain in force for a number of years.

I think our experts will as a matter of priority have to concern themselves with working out the concept of the transition period, of how long it should be and what it should contain.

We believe that maintaining for a transitional period the quadripartite rights and responsibilities and the presence in Germany of troops from the allied powers will exert a stabilizing influence on the whole process of building German unity and will create a calm and favorable external environment for it.

We think it is in the interests of Germany herself to arrange matters in such a way that the cessation of the quadripartite rights is the final step in the German settlement. There will be fewer misgivings and fears and more confidence and goodwill from all sides.

I should now like to draw your attention to the problem of synchronizing the solution to the German issue with the development of new pan-European security structures.

As regards the principles of the matter, this has cropped up time and again in speeches by USSR President M.S. Gorbachev.

We are glad that there is consensus on this score. I was interested to learn of the thoughts of the U.S. secretary of state, which he so kindly set out in his letter to me. I can find many congruous elements in our stances. I know that other of my counterparts here present have spoken in favor of a link between a German settlement and the creation of new pan-European security structures.

We also paid attention to the opinions voiced on this issue at the session of the European Council, which has just ended.

In our view, first and foremost we should be talking about eventually replacing the bloc structures with non-bloc structures, about a more definite formalization of the process of steadily reducing the level of military confrontation and steadily cutting conventional armed forces, and about scrapping nuclear and chemical armaments and other forms of weapons of mass destruction on a nonselective basis and on the basis of equal rights for all participants in the CSCE process.

On a practical level, we are talking about setting up effective mechanisms for pan-European interaction which, taken as a whole, would allow the security of all peoples in Europe to be assuredly maintained.

We believe we should seek to institutionalize the meetings of the top leaders of "Great Europe," and to hold this council at least once every two years.

Practically, we are already initiating such a regime of summit meetings.

It is clearly necessary to regularize the conferences of the foreign ministers of the 35 states—once a year as a minimum.

We suggest giving some thought to setting up a "coordinating bureau" drawn from the ministers and creating a technical secretariat to serve the new all-European institutions.

We attach special importance to setting up an all-European center, in Germany, to avert the danger of war.

I am now speaking only of the structures of security, since it is they that are primarily important for advancing a German settlement, and are directly connected with it.

It goes without saying that we are going to have to take a fresh look at the issues of creating in Europe so-called unified areas [yedinnye prostranstva]: legal, economic, ecological, and humanitarian.

In the coming days I intend to send special letters to all the foreign ministers of the member countries of the Helsinki process, setting out our views on the need for further institutionalizing of the all-European process. We have it in mind to support the idea that representatives of the 35 states should meet for a day or two at an agreed place and decide what action should be taken in this area.

We consider it highly important to ensure that, in parallel with the "Six", a group of experts from the 35 states will work on the problems of creating new all-European structures of security and cooperation.

I think that we, as the "Six", could jointly approach other participants of the CSCE with a proposal on this subject.

The German problem does not only have a European aspect. Many non-European states in the anti-Hitler coalition took part in the fight against fascism.

We have got to think seriously about what to do in order that they may not remain entirely uninvolved in a German settlement. that would give them a justified sense of grievance. I think we ought to give our experts special instructions to exchange opinions on this and make appropriate recommendations to the ministers.

While speaking about the process of German unity we cannot fail to express concern at the absence of essential movement at the talks on conventional forces in Vienna. It cannot simply be imagined that we would be in a state to tackle the military-political aspects of a German settlement without having an accord on a reduction of troops and armaments in Europe.

In our view, the talks in Vienna are a very important part of the process of synchronizing a German settlement with common European interests.

The talks require urgent additional stimuli, first of all on the part of the states which are present here. I think that such stimuli should ensue at the level of ministers who, it appears to me, could act here in the role of kinds of coordinators of what is being done in German and common European avenues in the sphere of security, troop reductions, and the adoption of confidence building measures.

Now about yet another issue which does not figure among those which have been included in the agenda for our meeting, but the participants in the "Six" cannot avoid it since it has a direct bearing about what we are discussing today.

The construction of a united Germany is taking place of necessity on territory which is saturated to the limit with troops and armaments.

The situation is such that, in addition to the several hundred thousand troops which are actually German, troops of a further seven states, including those of four great powers, are deployed in Germany today.

Here the most contemporary armaments are deployed, including armaments equipped with nuclear and chemical warheads.

Do we have the right to display complacency in such conditions, to rely on nothing happening in Germany despite such a potentially "explosive mixture," and on no emergency arising there?

An elementary sense of political responsibility demands that one should envisage a mechanism which would enable one to have full information about the miltiary and strategic situation in Germany and throughout Europe, about the movements and activities of all troops, and which also could fulfil the role of a center to prevent the danger of war and the emergence of crisis phenomena.

Therefore we believe that the creation of such a center and the formulation of procedures which would enable it to function with due efficiency is an urgent task.

At the same time, it seems to us that this institution should be formed from the outset with the potential of being a center to avert the danger of war for all Europe in the future.

As we already have proposed, such a center might be established on the basis of the existing allied structures in Germany, including the institutions of the liaison missions and of the Berlin Air Security Center.

Naturally, the German representatives would participate in the center's work on an equal basis and with the same rights as the others.

One would like to stress that this center would perform the functions of monitoring, inspecting, and observing all military activity on the territory of Germany—to an equal extent for the Soviet, U.S., British, French, German and other Armed Forces.

The creation of such a center would be an important step not only from the point of view of maintaining current stability and security and also of settling possible disputed issues, but would also practically place us, I stress this, on the road toward the formation of a new generation, a new level of pan-European structures for strengthening confidence measures of and for carrying out monitoring and inspection [kontrolno-inspektsionnaya] activities within the framework of Europe as a whole. The center would be the first building block in the foundation of new security structures within the framework of the Helsinki process, something toward which we are all striving.

It could also be the first practical step in the matter of synchronizing German unification and the Helsinki process.

If such structures started to function, then it would also be possible to look at military-political issues which now seem complex in a new way.

In conclusion, I would like to single out the thought that history is granting us a truly unique chance to construct the new European peaceful order in such a way that it becomes a model for the Europe of the 21st century. We must live in our common European home worthily, in peace and cooperation.

From the point of view of the future, the "Two Plus Four" formula represents an extremely important mechanism for determining the future fate of Europe. I will speak very frankly: We all probably have no interest in the work of the "Six" being described as a "period of missed opportunities." But such a thing has already occurred since the war. There were times when historic chances opened up but we did not take advantage of them.

We can do our work well only if we have crystal-clear intentions, the highest degree of frankness, and an understanding of the historic significance of our task. Attempts to gain one-sided advantages, put our partner in a position of isolation, ignore his interests, be clever, or get the better of each other have always ended badly. They are all the more out of place in issues connected with Germany and with European stability and security.

Let us play this new, and last, game in German affairs in a businesslike way and with a full awareness of all the dangers that lie in wait for Europe on its path into the 21st century.

I have in my time taken part in many negotiations and meetings. Yet I consider my participation in the work of the "Six" to be the most important and decisive task ever entrusted to me. I can assure you that I shall approach it with the very highest sense of responsiblity.

And in conclusion, let me say—not as a formality, but for the sake of the truth—a word or two of appreciation to our hosts, and above all to my friend Mr. Hans-Dietrich Genscher, for that rare quality: Tact, amicability, and the ability to create in the most difficult circumstances an atmosphere conducive to calm and serious work and the quest for solutions and compromises.

And of course one must remark on the faultless way this meeting has been organized, and thank the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany for this.

Thank you for your attention.

Talks Reviewed

LD0505191390 Moscow TASS in English 1857 GMT 5 May 90

[Text] Bonn May 5 TASS—The foreign ministers of the two German states and four victorious powers—France, the Soviet Union, the United States, and Britain held their first meeting in Bonn today.

They briefed each other on the fundamental positions of their countries on the foreign aspects of the German unity. The talks revealed the similarity of views and also differences on some questions, especially on the military-political status of a united Germany.

The Soviet delegation said that the united Germany's membership of NATO was unacceptable for the Soviet Union, because it would touch the Soviet Union's security interests and disrupt the balance of forces in Europe. The solution of the German issue should be synchronized with the development of the structures of European security which should replace the military-political blocs.

The sides agreed on the agenda of the future "Two Plus Four" meetings. The foreign ministers are planning to discuss the question of Poland's western borders with Polish participation, military-political problems with the aim of creating further European security structures, as well as the Berlin issue.

At the final stage, the six powers should solve the question of the rights and responsibility of the four powers towards Germany and Berlin.

The foreign ministers of the "Six" agreed to hold their next meetings in Berlin, Paris, and Moscow.

All the six ministers took part in a news conference in Bonn.

Shevardnadze Interviewed

LD0505193890 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1700 GMT 5 May 90

[Video report by correspondent V. Kondratyev, including interview with USSR Foreign Minister E.A. Shevardnadze, from the "Two Plus Four" talks in Bonn on 5 May—recorded; from the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] [Announcer] Today the first meeting of the foreign ministers of the two German states and of the four victorious powers—the USSR, the United States, Great Britain, and France—took place in Bonn. A report by Vladimir Kondratyev.

[Kondratyev] From the moment of the motorcade's arrival at the FRG Foreign Ministry, until the last journalist left the session hall, a whole 40 minutes passed. For Bonn that is probably a record for a so-called phototime, the time given over to the press. There are still several meetings at ministerial level to come. But this will always remain in history as the first. Work is beginning on developing joint decisions on the borders of the future united Germany, on its Armed Forces and their status, and on the continuity of their obligations and the presence of military contingents from the allied powers on German territory. So far, the quadrilateral rights and responsibilities of the victorious powers as regards the whole of Germany are still in force. But what will happen when after the transition period a huge country, with huge potential, will have to construct its policies independently? What should be done so that the German model is without shortcomings, so that a repetition of the past is excluded? How will, on the basis of a treaty, the obligations not to deploy on German soil atomic, chemical, and other weapons of mass destruction be consolidated? Can the unique chance of making German reunification a motor for overcoming the European schism by utilized? Soviet people are no less concerned by these questions, and probably even more so, than other nations. The most important thing is not to create grounds for a new confrontation and not to try and outplay each other. [Video shows motorcades arriving and Genscher greeting Meckel, and then Shevardnadze, as they alight from their cars. Scenes from the session hall show the participants, including Douglas Hurd, seated at a round table] During one of the breaks I interviewed Eduard Amvrosiyevich Shevardnadze.

[Shevardnadze] I think that it is not a bad start, a good start. And the most important thing, probably, is that the ministers were able to put forward their views on all the basic problems, relating to the external aspects of constructing German unity. I cannot say that there is complete mutual understanding on all problems.

[Kondratyev] Is the Soviet Union proposing any alternative, specific decisions in order to untie the existing knots of contradictions?

[Shevardnadze] This needs to be worked on. This problem must be worked on. We spoke about this in our speeches. It is necessary to look for a solution to the central problems, especially as regards the military-political status of a united Germany. It is necessary to look for a solution which will be acceptable both to the Soviet people and the Soviet state and to the West. [Video shows Shevardnadze being interviewed by Kondratyev]

[Kontratyev] This evening after the talks finish a joint news conference of the participants is envisaged. [Video shows the six foreign ministers standing in a line outside for photographers]

Participants Answer Questions

LD0605101990 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0803 GMT 6 May 90

[Excerpts] Bonn, 6 May (TASS)—The foreign ministers of the FRG, the GDR, France, the USSR, the United States, and Great Britain have held a concluding news conference here on the results of their "Two Plus Four" talks. [passage omitted]

Soviet Foreign Minister E.A. Shevardnadze agreed with his colleagues that it had been a "historic day," since the process of bringing about German unity is of lasting significance for Europe and the entire world. The cold war has ended, he said. Our planet and Europe are entering a new phase, a peaceful period of development. The process of overcoming military confrontation and bringing about a real reduction in armaments is under way. The Helsinki process is developing. Certainly, without Helsinki, without Vienna, without these processes, which are developing intensively, it would be difficult to speak of Germany's unification. All these factors are a favorable background for the unification of two equal German states.

The meeting, which has ended, was truly useful, constructive, and very necessary. We did not set ourselves the task of crowning our meeting with the signing of some major document, a final settlement document, for example. That would have been naive. The ministers' main task was to set out the fundamental positions of our governments and states on the construction of German unity and the further dynamization of the pan-European process. I think we have accomplished this task. In the process, we have discovered that there are many fundamental questions on which our approaches are the same or similar. There also are serious differences, but I do not think we have to dramatize them. This is a normal part of the negotiating process.

I wish to assure you that the Soviet leadership and the Soviet delegation intend to work constructively with all our partners and with all European states to speed up this very important process of accomplishing German unity. I would like to say that the Soviet Union has the best of relations with the GDR. You are aware of the results of President Gorbachev's visit to Bonn, of the historic documents signed here in Bonn. All this enables the Soviet Union to make a weighty contribution to the solution of this task.

Of all the meetings that have taken place in Bonn, including those with my fellow ministers, I would like to single out the meeting with Chancellor Helmut Kohl. This was particularly important for our relations. Apart from questions on the agenda of the talks among the "Six," we discussed the prospects for the development of our bilateral relations. The Soviet delegation is satisfied with the results of the meeting and the atmosphere that prevailed at the talks. [passage omitted]

The participants in the news conference then answered journalists' questions.

[Question to Shevardnadze] Are military and political issues, including that of Germany's membership in NATO, to be tackled outside the framework of the talks among the "Six" or are these decisions to be adopted by this forum?

[Answer] It is the agenda of the meeting that testifies to the fact that the solution of military and political issues and external aspects of the construction of German unity ought to be discussed within the framework of the "Six."

[Question to Shevardnadze] Have you changed your position with respect to a united Germany's membership in NATO, and if so, on what conditions would you agree to it?

[Answer] An unambiguous answer to this question was given in my speech at the meeting. The talks are starting; it is a complex and painful process, but I am sure we will find mutually acceptable decisions that will suit the West and the East, the Soviet Union and the Western powers, and will correspond to the interests of the German nation. [passage omitted]

[Question to Shevardnadze] Are the "Two Plus Four" talks a forum for discussion of the question of Germany's membership in alliances, and can final solutions be adopted there?

[Answer] I would ask the person who has asked the question to familiarize himself thoroughly with the Ottawa formula. In the Ottawa decision on creating the mechanism of the "Six," this issue is dealt with fully, clearly, and unambiguously. As for the Soviet Union, we will adhere to this formula. This mechanism is being created for settling the external aspects of the construction of German unity, but this does not mean that all decisions without exception will be adopted within the framework of the "Six." There will be consultations and recommendations, there also will be decisions.

[Question to Shevardnadze] Can the work of the "Two Plus Four" forum be completed if such issues as Germany's membership in NATO and the question of the borders are not solved?

[Answer] I view this optimistically. I think we will manage to find mutually acceptible decisions for all these issues. [passage omitted]

[Question to J. Baker] Which specifically military-political questions cannot be resolved within the "Two Plus Four" framework? Do you see any prospect in the future of the USSR joining NATO?

[Answer] I do not foresee such a thing happening in the immediate future. There are a number of questions that are outside our competence and we cannot settle these within the framework of our present forum. These are military-political matters. One of them is the question of armed forces. Talks are now under way in Vienna, and each of the six countries is represented at these talks, along with other countries. This is the forum for the adoption of decisions on conventional armaments.

[Rejoinder by E.A. Shevardnadze] The Soviet Union has not yet applied for NATO membership. [passage omitted]

[Question to E.A. Shevardnadze] Could you please speak in more detail about your talks with Chancellor Kohl?

[Answer] These were important talks at which we reviewed the implementation of the agreements signed in Bonn last year. Much of what was outlined then is being carried out. Economic, scientific, and cultural cooperation, exchanges of people, and so on are developing successfully. We also acknowledged that the potential for cooperation between our two countries has not been fully harnessed. Much is being kept in reserve, and we spoke about ways of using these reserves.

[Question to E.A. Shevardnadze] Does the question of applying Article 23 of the FRG's Basic Law, on unification, have any bearing on the external aspects of bringing about German unity?

[Answer] The official Soviet position on Article 23 has been set out several times already, and I do not want to repeat it again. Our position, our fundamental approach to this is well known.

Participants Give News Briefing

LD0605114690 Moscow TASS in English 1132 GMT 6 May 90

[Text] Bonn May 6 TASS—The foreign ministers of West Germany, the German Democratic Republic and also France, the USSR, the United States and Britain gave a news conference here upon the completion of the talks under the "Two Plus Four" formula.

Opening the news conference, West German Foreign Minister Hans-Dietrich Genscher, who chaired the meeting, said that its participants agreed on the agenda of further talks of the six-nation foreign ministers.

It will include the issue of Poland's western borders, military-political problems, mindful of the consideration of approaches to acceptable security structures in Europe, and the Berlin issue.

The last item on the agenda will be a final international-legal settlement and revoking the four powers' rights and responsibilities for the whole of Germany and Berlin.

Genscher said all participants unanimously recognised that the Germans' aspiration to achieve unity is lawful just as all states should stand to benefit from this unity.

The goal of the talks should be an international-legal settlement of the German question.

According to Genscher, participants agreed on the procedure for further six-nation talks: They will meet in Berlin in June, in Paris in July, and in Moscow in late September.

The Polish foreign minister will be invited to the Paris meeting. He will set out Poland's point of view regarding its western borders.

German Democratic Republic Foreign Minister Markus Meckel described the meeting as "a big day for Germany and Europe." He said the German Democratic Republic felt it was an equal partner. None of the participants questioned the two German states' desire for unity and did not try to erect obstacles on this path.

"We will never forget solidarity with us, displayed by East European neighbours. For its part, the GDR supports Poland's proposals regarding the conclusion of a treaty on borders," Meckel said.

French Foreign Minister Roland Dumas emphasised that the talks passed in a constructive and friendly atmosphere. He expressed hope that it would be preserved at further negotiations.

Dumas said France would be glad to welcome in July representatives of Poland. He noted that his country would strive to find solutions in the spirit of solidarity. "France would like to spread its extensive bilateral relations with West Germany to the GDR and then to a unified Germany," Dumas said.

Soviet Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze agreed with the opinion of his colleagues that this was a "historic day", because the building of German unity was of unpassing significance for Europe and the entire world.

"The cold war is over. Our globe and Europe are entering a new stage, a peaceful period of their development. The process is under way to overcome military confrontation and achieve a de facto reduction in armaments. The Helsinki CSCE process is developing.

"It would, possibly, have been difficult to speak about building German unity without Helsinki, without Vienna and without these processes which are intensively developing. All these facts are a favourable backdrop for the merging of the two equal German states.

"The just-ended meeting was truly useful, constructive and sorely needed. We did not set to ourselves the task to conclude the meeting with the signing of any major document, for instance, a final document on settlement. It would be naive. The principal task of the ministers was to lay down the positions of our governments, our states towards building German unity and imparting further dynamics to the European process.

"I think that we have accomplished this task. In the process, it turned out that there are many fundamental issues, on which our approaches are identical or close. There are also serious divergencies. I think we need not dramatise them. This is a customary phenomenon for the negotiating process.

"I would like to assure you that the Soviet leadership, the Soviet delegation intend to work constructively with all of our partners, with all European states to expedite this very important process of building German unity", Shevardnadze said.

"I want to say that the Soviet Union has very good relations with the GDR. You are aware of the results of President Gorbachev's visit to Bonn and of the historic documents signed here in Bonn. All this enables the Soviet Union to make its own tangible contribution to accomplishing this task.

"Of all meetings held in Bonn, including with ministers, my colleagues, I would like to single out a meeting with West German Chancellor Helmut Kohl, which was of particular importance to our relations.

"In addition to the issues on the agenda of the six-nation talks, we discussed prospects for developing our bilateral relations. The Soviet delegation is satisfied with the results of the meeting and the atmosphere at the talks," Shevardnadze said.

U.S. Secretary of State James Baker stressed that the process of German unification in conditions of peace and freedom was developing successfully. In the process, all European peoples will finally become the winners. Energetic efforts need to be taken in this direction.

For forty years, the United States and West Germany pursued the task to achieve German unity. However, the interests of all states should be taken into account even after this unity is achieved, Baker said.

Other, wider forms are needed for many decisions, including in the security sphere. But the "Two Plus Four" talks can serve as an impetus to them, Baker said.

British Secretary of State for Foreign and Commonwealth Affairs Douglas Hurd noted that at the meeting it became clear that European history was at its crucial juncture. He said the British Government wishes to strengthen the frameworks of the "Two Plus Four" talks.

Germany should as soon as possible and orderly be unified and built into broader European frameworks.

On Poland's proposal concerning its Western borders, Hurd said that important tasks had to be accomplished in view of this.

Speaking again as the representative of West Germany, Genscher noted that "Germans wanted a single Germany in a single Europe." They want unification to become a contribution to stability on the continent. It is the responsibility and obligation of all Germans as Europeans to work in this direction.

"In solving the problems of the external aspects of unification, it is necessary to have a clear understanding of what should be unified. It is West Germany, the GDR and Berlin—no more and no less.

"The governments of both German states stated today that Poland's Western border with Germany should be part of a treaty between a future united Germany and Poland. During the meeting, participants rightly emphasised the immense importance of the CSCE process and the Helsinki Final Act. We intend to lend a new quality to the Final Act, expand and deepen the CSCE process, and impart practical organisational forms to it," Genscher said.

Shevardnadze, Baker View Talks

LD0605143190 Moscow TASS in English 1410 GMT 6 May 90

[Text] Bonn May 6 TASS—Asked, during a news conference upon the results of the "Two Plus Four" meeting, whether military-political problems, including Germany's membership in NATO, are subject to consideration within the framework of the six-nation talks or at another forum, Soviet Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze said:

"The very agenda of the meeting illustrates that the solution of military-political issues and the external aspects of building German unity are subject to discussion within the framework of the six-nation talks."

Simultaneously, Shevardandze noted that his stance regarding a united Germany's membership in NATO did not change. "The unequivocal answer to this question was made in my speech at the meeting. Talks are getting under way. This is a complex and painful process. But I am sure that we will find mutually acceptable solutions, which will suit both West and East, the Soviet Union and Western powers, solutions which will accord with the interests of the German nation," Shevardnadze stressed.

U.S. Secretary of State James Baker, asked whether the proposal for a "Two Plus Four" conference is an attempt to turn it into a certain governing committee to approve decisions on definite themes, said: "We did not mean transforming the 'Two Plus Four' forum into a governing committee. There is a range of issues, which, alongside discussion at these talks, should be forwarded to other forums to make final decisions on them."

Shevardnadze, commenting on a question whether the "Two Plus Four" talks are a forum to discuss Germany's membership in alliances and if final decisions could be made at it, noted that "the earlier Ottawa decision to set up the 'six-nation' mechanism tells about this explicitly.

"As for the Soviet Union, we will be guided by this formula. This mechanism is formed to settle the external aspects of building Germany unity. But this does not mean that all decisions without exception will be made within the 'six-nation' framework. There will be consultations, recommendations and there will also be decisions."

Shevardnadze stressed that he was optimistic about the outcome of the "Two Plus Four" forum. "I think that we will be able to find mutually acceptable solutions on all issues," he said.

Answering the same question, Baker said that, in his view, the "Two Plus Four" talks could be capped with decisions which are within the competence of this mechanism. But he said there were issues which were beyond its competence.

Baker said he concurred with Shevardnadze that they would succeed in completing work satisfactory. [sentence as received] Baker said that there were issues, on which there was broad consensus, and the ones on which decisions would be made. There are many issues, on which consultations should be held at this forum.

Touching on specific military-political issues, which, in his view, should not be solved within the "Two Plus Four" forum, Baker said that there were several issues, on which they did not have powers to make decisions and they could not solve them within their forum. One of them is the issue of the armed forces. Negotiations are under way in Vienna now and each of the six countries is represented at them just like other countries. It is a forum to adopt decisions on conventional armaments.

Asked if a sovereign Germany will be able to make independent decisions on the strength of its armed forces, their deployment in the eastern part of the country, on possessing nuclear and other weapons, Baker said that, as for West Germany, its armed forces are a part of NATO. Decisions about this can be made at close consultations with allies. Ultimately, basic decisions concerning a nation's armed forces should be made by the nation itself.

Shevardnadze, commenting, at journalists' request, on the content of his talks with West German Chancellor Helmut Kohl, noted that "those were important talks, which summed up how the agreements signed in Bonn last year are being implemented. Cooperation in the economy, science, culture and interpersonal contacts are successfully developing. We also stated that the potential of cooperation between our two countries was not used to its full extent. There are great reserves here and we spoke about ways to utilise these reserves," Shevardnadze said.

Achievements Cited

PM0605183190 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 7 May 90 Morning Edition p 1

[Own correspondent Ye. Bovkun dispatch: "Markers Set"]

[Text] Bonn—Naturally, the Bonn conference of six foreign ministers, who had come together for the first time to place the problems of German and European unity on a practical footing, did not culminate in the signing of a specific document. It simply defined the ultimate objective, formulated the agenda, and mapped out the sequence of forthcoming meetings. It also established an institute of political directors, who will be responsible for the fine detail of the agenda.

On Saturday evening, all six of the participants, led by FRG Foreign Minister H.-D. Genscher, appeared before journalists in the conference hall of the "Maritime" Hotel to speak in turn and answer questions.

The chairman briefly summed up the results of the first round. The agenda of the conferences, which must be completed in the fall, just before the start of the "greater Europe" meeting (of the CSCE participants), will consist of four points: the question of Poland's western borders; military-political problems in light of the new security structures for Europe; the problem of Berlin; and, finally, questions of the international-legal settlement of the unification of the two German states—including the abolition of the four-power postwar agreements on responsibility "for Germany as a whole."

We do not want a German Europe but we do want to create a European Germany, Genscher said in particular, on behalf of the Germans. The two German states do not simply see national unity as a German political objective but also as their contribution to building a new Europe. Consequently, they link their path to unity very closely with the European process.

The GDR foreign minister defined the task of the summit-level consultations as being to overcome the historical and spiritual division of Europe. His Paris colleague said that France supports the German unification process. Pointing to the existence of firm, multifaceted ties between France and the FRG, he expressed the intention to extend the nature and scale of these ties to the GDR as well.

The mechanism of the conferences, based on the "Two Plus Four" formula, is the result of recognition that a historic process has begun, U.S. Secretary of State J. Baker said. Our six countries are taking part in the action of reconciling a people divided. German unification must stimulate the strengthening of collaboration structures between East and West.

The British representative, who recalled W. Churchill's words that a united Europe cannot live without a free,

united Germany, voiced particular satisfaction regarding the agreement that a Polish representative should attend the Paris meeting.

The main task of the consultations in Bonn was to set out opinions and views regarding the implementation of German unification and impart greater dynamism to the development of the process of shaping the new relations in Europe. The Bonn conference resolved this task. However, there are still differences of opinion among its participants, including among representatives of the Western powers, regarding the methods of overcoming the German and European split. The Soviet minister was maybe the only one of the participants in the "Maritime" news conference who talked about this frankly, prompting a mass of questions.

They contained a certain measure of objectivity. It is true that the Soviet side's objection to a united Germany being a member of NATO is a considerable obstacle to the attainment of compromise at present, although Moscow is no longer insisting on neutral status for this new state formation. It must not be forgotten, however, that the FRG's allies in NATO and the "Common Market" have their own fears regarding the role of a future united Germany which they do not always discuss openly. And then, if we are going to be totally objective: No unification would have been possible at all if perestroyka and democratization had not begun in the Soviet Union.

'Dynamic Start' Noted

PM0605185190 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 7 May 90 First Edition p 6

[Own correspondent Yevgeniy Grigoryev commentary: "Dynamic Start. On Results of Meeting Within Framework of 'Two Plus Four' Group"]

[Text] Bonn—In the same hall of Bonn's "Maritime" Hotel where the Conference on Economic Cooperation in Europe was held a month ago, the stage—decorated with the flags of the Soviet Union, France, the GDR, the FRG, Britain, and the United States—was ascended by these states' foreign ministers. This, I would say, was the rather festive conclusion to their one-day meeting within the framework of the "Two Plus Four" group established to settle the foreign policy aspects of German unification.

The Bonn conference managed to agree without any particular difficulty on the agenda and schedule of future work. The ministers agreed that they must discuss and resolve four ranges of questions: on borders; military-political matters, including security problems; the question of Berlin; and a definitive international-legal settlement and the liquidation of the four powers' rights and responsibilities in relation to all Germany and Berlin. They reached an accord on Polish participation in the discussion of border issues. As we can see, this is a very considerable result for the first meeting.

Every section of the forthcoming work is complex enough. But the question of Germany's future military-political status is more than complex.

However, it would be wrong not to see the broad areas of consensus or proximity of views behind this "forest" of problems. The most important thing for the Germans is that the four great powers have confirmed their support for the desire of the German people and both German states for creating all-European structures and to the need for both the United States and the Soviet Union to play a part in all-European affairs. Times are changing. E.A. Shevardnadze said that the cold war is over. Baker said that the end of the postwar period has come. The head of British diplomacy, D. Hurd, said that the group's work should draw the final line under the last world war. Essentially the same idea was expressed in different words. And this, in my view, is another vital feature of the Bonn meeting, because it disposes the "Six," as the "Two Plus Four" group is still called, to constructive joint activity. This desire can only be welcomed, because it has significance not only for the long-term solution of German affairs but also for other international problems of our time.

It is perhaps still rather early to call the session in Bonn "historic," as a number of the meeting's participants have done. There is still a great deal of work ahead. It will not be so easy to overcome some notions of the past decades which stem from bloc politics. It is another matter that the first meeting at foreign minister level has really boosted work concerning the external aspects of building German unity and synchronizing it with the all-European process.

All that remains is to give you the schedule for the subsequent ministerial meetings on the basis of the "two plus four" formula. June—Berlin. July—Paris. Early September—Moscow. A dynamic pace has been set.

Genscher Interviewed

LD0605212490 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1700 GMT 6 May 90

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] [V. Kondratev, identified by screen caption] No one expected any accords at the first stage. The sides set out their concepts in principle and exchanged opinions. On Saturday evening in the Maritime Hotel, which is

becoming established in Bonn as a venue for international meetings, people waited with impatience to hear what the leaders of the delegations would say about the beginning of the negotiations process. The mood was not at all dispirited, as one might assume against the background of the existing differences on the issue of Germany's military-political status. The leaders of the foreign policy departments stressed that the discussions had passed off constructively, with trust and a desire to seek mutually acceptable solutions. The British minister stated that a line was being drawn under the last world war. He was echoed by Baker, speaking of the end of the postwar period. The words of our minister have been quoted by television companies and are being cited in today's papers:

[Begin Shevardnadze recording] I wish to assure you that the Soviet delegation and the Soviet leadership are inclined to work constructively with all our partners, with all European states, to accelerate this very important historical process, the construction of German unity. [end recording]

[Kondratev] On the eve of the conference there were many reproaches, to the effect that the Soviet Union knows very well what it doesn't want—it says that Germany should not be a member of NATO—but it wasn't clear what it did want. The Bonn conference has shown that specific proposals on the establishment of new structures which go beyond the framework of the military blocs are emananting precisely from our side. We have proposed that a common machinery should be set up for monitoring the military-strategic situation in Germany: a center to avert the danger of war and crisis phenomena, where German representatives would participate on an equal footing with other states. Hans Dietrich Genscher, the longest-serving foreign minister in the world, hasn't been feeling very well in the past days; overwork is showing. But, nevertheless, he came to the Bonn television studio for a broadcast, before which we held a short interview with him as well. What was his assessment of the course and the results of this first conference, which is already being described as historic and in the meeting for which he played the role of architect? [Begin Genscher recording in German with superimposed Russian translation] This really was an historic meeting, and I think that all the participants were conscious of their responsibility at this historic hour. This conference opens wide-ranging prospects not just for the unification of Germans, but also for the unification of all Europe for the benefit of all the peoples living on the continent. [end recording]

[Kondratev] And so Bonn hands over the talks baton on the external aspects of German unification to other capitals. It has been announced that the next stage of the conference of the Six will be held in Berlin in June. In July it will be in Paris and in September in Moscow. [video shows press conference, Shevardnadze and Genscher to camera]

NATO Council Session Held in Brussels

Woerner Briefs Journalists

PM0405152690 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 5 May 90 Morning Edition p 4

[Own correspondent B. Moskvichev report under general heading: "Outlines of a Future Europe"]

[Text] Brussels—The extraordinary session of the NATO Council at foreign ministerial level held in Brussels focused its attention, as was expected, on the problem of the unification of the two German states and the alliance's role in the European community.

As NATO Secretary General M. Woerner told journalists, the participants in the session held intensive talks on a range of problems concerning Europe's future and arms control questions in the lgiht of the changes that have taken place in the countries of the central and eastern part of the old continent.

The foreign ministers of the North Atlantic alliance member countries, as Woerner stressed, are firmly convinced that a united Germany should be in NATO, and that this will be a guarantee of the stability of the situation in Europe. At the same time he noted that there should be neither nuclear nor chemical weapons on the territory of the future Germany.

M. Woerner stressed particularly that the North Atlantic alliance intends to exploit the emerging situation in order to move from confrontation with the East to cooperation with it. The participants in the extraordinary session came out in favor of holding a conference of heads and states of governments of the 35 countries within the "Helsinki-2" framework before the end of the year; an agreement on reducing armed forces and conventional arms should be signed at the conference.

In the ministers' opinion the Lithuanian problem can only be resolved through peaceful dialogue, in which the maximum degree of flexibility should prevail.

U.S. Secretary of State J. Baker, who then spoke, stated, in connection with the architecture of the future Europe, that NATO's role will certainly increase and the alliance will become the bulwark of European security at a certain stage. He also stressed the significance of nuclear weapons and conventional arms and of NATO's strategy.

Touching on the central topic of the session, the problems of German unification, the secretary of state stated firmly that Germany should remain within the NATO system and the question cannot be open to debate.

'Closer to Reality' on Some Issues

PM0405223790 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 5 May 90 Second Edition p 6

[Own correspondent V. Peresada dispatch: "Closer to Reality"]

[Text] Brussels, 4 May—The Belgian press is calling the extraordinary NATO Council session held in Brussels the meeting that marks the beginning of the North Atlantic alliance's adaptation to the new Europe. It is certainly true that its results justify this assessment to a considerable extent.

The "highlight" of the meeting was U.S. Secretary of State J. Baker's announcement of Washington's decision to abandon plans to modernize short-range nuclear missiles stationed in Europe. In principle, this decision—dictated by the changed situation on the continent—had been expected: Many U.S. allies have spoken out sharply against modernization. Even more vital is the fact that, according to Baker, Washington is prepared to start talks on reducing tactical nuclear weapons. What is more, the condition that the start of talks be linked to the implementation of an agreement to cut conventional arms in Europe has been lifted. This amendment in the U.S. position met broad support from the session participants.

Addressing the concluding news conference, NATO Secretary General M. Woerner said that the Brussels meeting is the beginning of a whole series of conferences which will discuss the alliance's tasks in the new climate. One of the most important will be the NATO Council session at summit level, planned for the end of June in London. Woerner stressed that NATO must use this historic opportunity to move away from confrontation and toward cooperation with the countries of East Europe.

This intention is confirmed by a series of decisions taken in Brussels. For example, it officially supported the idea of convening a meeting of the heads of states and governments of the 35 CSCE member countries by the end of this year, at which time there are plans to sign a treaty on reducing conventional arms and armed forces in Europe. The session participants decided to support France's proposal to hold this forum in Paris, and also the U.S. initiative to organize a preparatory meeting of the 35 states' foreign ministers during the forthcoming UN General Assembly session.

On the eve of the session the Western press was circulating rumors that it was going to adopt a tough "anti-Moscow" resolution on Lithuania. However, a realistic, considered approach prevailed. It was stated that dialogue is needed to resolve this problem and that both sides should try to compromise.

Unfortunately, the participants in the meeting failed to show the necessary flexibility on such a major issue of European politics as the unification of the two German states. The session merely stated its already well-known stand, which amounts to the fact that "a unified Germany must be a full member of NATO." True, it is intended that the zone in which the alliance's Armed Forces are stationed will not be extended, and that a unified Germany will not possess nuclear and chemical weapons. However, no other option for its military-political status that would consider the viewpoint of many other states, the Soviet Union in particular, was proposed.

However, as a whole the Brussels session was an important landmark in the current "perestroyka" in NATO. What is important is how consistently it will be implemented. After all, it is often the case that attempts are made to compensate positive decisions with actions of an opposite nature. How, for example, is one to explain the fact that, parallel to the decision to forego the modernization of land-based short-range nuclear missiles, a project is being drafted to deploy new missiles of the same type on warplanes? There are also other questions which are a source of concern, and make one think....

United States & Canada

Moscow TV Reports Prunskiene's Washington Visit

LD0405193590 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1700 GMT 4 May 90

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] [Announcer] Of the events that are bound up with the situation in Lithuania, today the main one is the visit to the United States by Prunskiene, chairwoman of the republic's Council of Ministers. Our Washington correspondent Boris Kalyagin, has the details:

[Kalyagin] The U.S. Senate decided to do its little bit to stir up the situation around Lithuania. Most of the senators spoke against any expansion of trading relations with the Soviet Union until such time as—as their resolution states—Moscow lifts its economic embargo against Lithuania. The hardening of the senators' stand coincided with the arrival in Washington of Kazimiera Prunskiene, chairwoman of the Council of Ministers of the Lithuanian Soviet Socialist Republic. The head of the Lithuanian Government appeared at hearings in the U.S. Congress Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe. She called on the U.S. Administration to put pressure on the Soviet leadership, to force it to agree to Lithuania's secession from the USSR. This statement has delighted right-wing U.S. legislators. However, those politicians who take a realistic view of things do not approve of such a one-sided approach to the Lithuanian question. They reject the accusations leveled by the Lithuanian nationalist leaders, who have dubbed the White House's balanced policy and President Bush's reluctance to apply economic sanctions against the Soviet Union as a new Munich.

The U.S. President agreed to meet Prunskiene, not as the prime minister of an independent Lithuania, but—as was emphasized—as a freely elected representative of the Lithuanian people. George Bush rejected Prunskiene's suggestion that he should be a go-between in the talks between Vilnius and Moscow. At the same time, however, he reiterated his position that he is in favor of a settlement to the Lithuanian problem being reached through peaceful dialogue, and without the application of force.

Most Americans today recognize that the difficulties that have surfaced following the Lithuanian leaders' unilateral actions should not get in the way of the historic changes that are taking place in the Soviet Union and in the countries of Eastern Europe, and should not hinder progress toward disarmament and the development of cooperation between East and West. It is this opinion that is reflected in the U.S. Administration's decisions to ease restrictions on the export of complex technology to the Soviet Union, and to shelve its modernization plans for tactical nuclear weapons in Europe. [video shows shots of the Senate, inside and out; Prunskiene appearing before the congressional commission; Bush talking to Prunskiene]

'Activation of Military' in USSR Worries Bush

PM0605181790 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 6 May 90 p 1

[M. Chikin-prepared roundup of foreign press news under the headline: "Front-Page News"]

[Excerpt] The top news item in the U.S. press and on U.S. television is K. Prunskiene's visit to the United States. ABC-TV began its report from Washington as follows: "There have been two meetings in the White House. Jamaican Prime Minister Michael Manley drew up at the main entrance of the presidential residence in a smart limousine, whereupon he was greeted by representatives of the administration. The Lithuanian prime minister and her entourage entered the White House on foot. Essentially, she is a head of government just like the Jamaican prime minister. So as not to offend the woman, the president called her prime minister during their conversation, although he himself has not recognized her as such."

The newspapers have also reported Prunskiene's meeting in the U.S. Congress' Helsinki Commission. Here are just some of her replies to questions from senators and congressmen.

"Could you not tell us in detail about the people with whom you are managing to continue trading and engaging in barter exchange in the Soviet Union? Who are these people?"

Prunskiene: "We have a number of strong trading partners, including in Moscow and Leningrad, and we have trade agreements with neighboring republics—the Ukraine and Belorussia—and with individual cities, with Lvov in the Ukraine, and also with Tyumen, which has oil and is prepared to sell us a certain quantity of its oil in exchange for food."

"What will happen if you fail to secure the international guarantees you are seeking? Would you be prepared to suspend the laws on independence you have adopted?"

Prunskiene: "As far as the question of international guarantees is concerned, we will continue to try to engage the Soviet Union in negotiations whether we secure them or not. We are prepared to compromise, but we will not renounce our independence."

The front page of the 4 May issue of THE WASHINGTON POST carries an article by its own correspondent A. Devroy, who writes: "President Bush has called for a major review of NATO's political and military tasks and has officially announced his decision to abandon plans to build new short-range nuclear missiles, which have become redundant as a result of the political changes in Europe.

"The President has expressed concern in connection with the activation of the military in the Soviet Union, who, he said, could block progress at arms control talks." [passage omitted]

Bush 3 May White House News Conference Reported

PM0405203390 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 5 May 90 Morning Edition p 1

[TASS report: "New Era of History. Statement by U.S. President"]

[Text] Speaking at a news conference in the White House 3 May, U.S. President Bush made the following statement: The revolutionary changes which are transforming Europe are transporting us from the postwar era to a new era of history, the era which goes beyond containment. The 1989 revolutions which have brought democracy to Eastern Europe have created the prospect of German reunification and, I hope, the conditions for the conclusion in the near future of an agreement on conventional forces, and they are taking us closer to the time when Europe, united and free, will become more stable.

Tomorrow, during the degree award ceremony at Oklahoma State University, I will speak about my concept of America's place in the new Europe, and I would like to therefore avail myself of today's news conference to highlight a number of ideas which I intend to enlarge upon tomorrow.

We have reached this historic stage thanks to having maintained active partnership relations with our European allies. NATO will continue to play a vitally important role in defining America's position in respect of Europe. The Western alliance is ready now to assume new tasks. And in order to outline the West's new strategy for these times, following personal consultations with my colleagues from the allied countries and the consultations which Secretary of State Baker concluded in Brussels today, I am calling for the convocation of a NATO summit conference in early summer, possibly in late June or early July. The main objective of this summit conference must be to lay the groundwork for a large-scale NATO strategy in respect of the transformed Europe in the nineties.

In order to determine the thrust of this meeting, I am proposing that, first, the future political task of the Western alliance should be discussed at this summit conference and its decisive role in the implementation of leadership and stabilization of the transformations in Europe reaffirmed; second, that the Western alliance's conventional means of defense for the future and subsequent steps in the sphere of conventional arms control be defined. At a moment when we are still living through a transitional period and Soviet forces are withdrawing from Eastern Europe, while our activities in the sphere of arms control are moving forward, it is necessary for us to work out a new strategy for the future.

And, third, it is necessary to define the role of U.S. nuclear forces in Europe. As democracy becomes established in Eastern Europe and Soviet troops return home, the need for the shortest-range nuclear systems will decrease. In connection with these new conditions I have decided to refrain from continuing the Lance program and to cancel all further modernization of shells for the U.S. nuclear artillery deployed in Europe. At the NATO summit conference it will be necessary to agree the broad objectives of future talks between the United States and the Soviet Union on the short-range nuclear missiles currently sited in Europe inasmuch as these talks are to open shortly after the signing of a treaty on conventional forces in Europe.

Fourth, it will be necessary to examine the question of a future CSCE conference, with a view to ensuring that the conference, and especially the East European states taking part in it, assume a more active role in shaping Europe's future. The CSCE may contribute to the creation of new free societies and become a forum for political dialogue in a united Europe. My colleagues from the allied countries and I must reach agreement on the discussion of these aims at a summit meeting within the CSCE framework this fall which will be held at approximately the time of the signing of a treaty on conventional forces in Europe.

The future of the United States is inseparable from the future of Europe, and therefore, together with our allies, we must prepare for the splendid opportunities which are opening up before us. In these times of uncertainty and hope NATO will retain its vital significance for determining the place of the United States in Europe, and also as a bulwark of democratic values and security.

This is why I am going to speak about precisely this tomorrow, and this is also precisely what Baker has discussed with our allies in Brussels yesterday and today.

Bush Comments on Lithuania

PM0505175190 Moscow TRUD in Russian 5 May 90 p 3

[Dispatch by TRUD correspondent V. Sisnev: "White House and Public Opinion. Political Passions Surrounding Events in Lithuania"]

[Text] Washington, 4 May—The other day at his regular news conference in the White House President Bush was asked how he feels about being accused of pursuing a "Munich policy" in relation to Lithuania. He shrugged his shoulders and replied that he is doing the will of the majority of the American people. The President was obviously thinking of the latest public opinion poll, which, like all the previous ones, clearly indicated the reluctance of the overwhelming majority of Americans to sacrifice the new quality of U.S.-Soviet relations for the sake of supporting the independence proclaimed by the Lithuanian Supreme Soviet.

One of the questions, asked at the request of the newspaper THE WALL STREET JOURNAL and NBC-TV, was worded as follows: "Lithuania recently declared itself independent. What do you think: Should the United States recognize independent Lithuania or would it be better not to interfere in this dispute?" A total of 64

percent spoke out in favor of noninterference. Only 30 percent favored recognition of Lithuania.

A different stand has been taken and continues to be taken by Congress, and particularly by the House of Representatives. Relying on the clearly expressed opinion of the majority, President Bush has so far resisted the pressure being exerted from Capitol Hill. Especially as he has been supported in this by even the most conservative of political observers.

For example, an article by John Oaks appeared in THE NEW YORK TIMES 21 April under the expressive title: "Mr. Bush, Put Pressure on the Lithuanians." In the article, this well-known publicist recommends that his President persuade Lithuania "not to provoke Moscow to use force." He writes, in particular: "If, on the other hand, the Lithuanians try to get their own way, consoling themselves with the hope that the United States will be on their side until the end, it will spell catastrophe for the Lithuanians themselves, harm Gorbachev, and promise great danger for America." Oaks is particularly emphatic that "the President will not be able to promote a peaceful, constructive solution to this painful problem if he succumbs to pressure from right-wing forces demanding that he immediately 'put pressure on Gorbachev'—even going as far as postponing the summit meeting until a more favorable time."

But Bush did receive Lithuanian Prime Minister Kasimiera Prunskiene in his office when she arrived on an unofficial visit—in transit via Canada. White House Press Secretary Fitzwater explained this by saying the President wanted to gain "firsthand" information on events in Lithuania and that he met Prunskiene as "a freely elected representative of the Lithuanian people" and not as Lithuanian prime minister.

News of this meeting almost coincided with another piece of news: on the Senate's adoption of a "nonbinding" resolution, approved in a 73-24 vote. It was proposed by the Republican senator of New York State, A. d'Amato. The essence of the resolution is to make it clear to the President that if he were to send Congress a decree on granting the Soviet Union most-favored-nation status now, while the confrontation between Moscow and Vilnius is going on, this step would not find support from congressmen.

Naturally, journalists accredited to the White House wanted to know whether this unexpected meeting with the head of the Lithuanian Government means a change in the state administration's present course. To this Fitzwater replied that "We do not recognize Lithuania and nothing has changed in this respect."

The White House statement on the results of the conversation notes that the head of the White House "strongly urged all sides to enter into dialogue in a spirit of goodwill and stressed his wish to see the situation in Lithuania settled by peaceful means and without threats."

I do not think there is any point at present in adding any comments on this score.

TASS on Bush Commencement Speech on NATO

LD0405224490 Moscow TASS in English 2220 GMT 4 May 90

[By TASS correspondent Andrey Fedyashin]

[Text] Washington May 5 TASS—U.S. President George Bush made a speech in Stillwater, Oklahoma, at Oklahoma State University commencement, setting out the basic orientations of his administration's European policy for the near future.

In his remarks President Bush urged the USA's NATO allies to hold a NATO strategy review summit soon with due regard for large-scale changes taking place on the continent and to determine NATO's unified position on conventional arms reductions and to work out a common approach to talks with the Soviet Union on further cuts in tactical nuclear weapons in Europe.

He said the U.S. was prepared to hold such talks. Bush also favoured a further invigoration of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe (CSCE) process.

The U.S. President said Europe was entering "a new age of freedom in a time of uncertainty, but great hope" and that East European countries "are going through social, political and economic transformations". He said that in Eastern Europe, the governments that previously were America's adversaries are now its partners.

Bush specially touched upon changes in the Soviet Union. The process of change in the Soviet Union is still unfinished, he said.

"It will be crucial to see, for example, whether Moscow chooses coercion or peaceful dialogue in responding to the aspirations of the Lithuanian people, and nationalities within the Soviet Union. The only noble answers lies in a dialogue that results in unencumbered self-determination for Lithuania."

"President Gorbachev has made profound progress in his country," Bush said. "Reforms so fundamental that the clock cannot be turned back. Yet neither can we turn the clock ahead to know for sure what kind of country the Soviet Union will be in years to come."

The U.S. President said that "the United States should remain a European power in the broadest sense—politically, militarily and economically" and added that the "foundation for America's peaceful engagement in Europe has been and will continue to be, NATO."

Bush said that the time has come for NATO to "define its objectives for the next century," and join together "to craft a new Western strategy for new and changing times."

In this connection he said that, following his consultations with Prime Minister Thatcher in Bermuda, President Mitterrand in Florida, Chancellor Kohl at Camp David and by telephone or cable with NATO Secretary-General Woerner and all of his other allied colleagues "I am calling for an early summit meeting of all NATO leaders."

Bush pointed out that "the fundamental purpose of this summit should be to launch a wide-ranging NATO strategy review for the transformed Europe of the 1990s."

The President believes that the review should involve four critical points: "the political role NATO can play in the new Europe", "the conventional forces the alliance will need in the time ahead and NATO's goals for conventional arms control," "the role of nuclear weapons based in Europe—and Western objectives in new nuclear arms control negotiations between the U.S. and the Soviet Union," and "strengthening the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe—the CSCE".

Specifying NATO tasks, Bush said that the bloc should play a greater political role in Europe. In his remarks he again declared in favour of keeping a united Germany a full member of NATO.

Bush said that although "it will take some time before the Soviet military presence is gone from Eastern Europe, we need to develop our strategy for that world now."

"Obviously, Soviet actions will be critical," he said, adding that "even after all the planned reductions in its forces are complete, even if our current arms control proposals are agreed to and implemented, the Soviet military will still field forces dwarfing those of any other single European state."

Therefore, he said, "militarily significant U.S. forces must remain on the other side of the Atlantic for as long as our allies want and need them."

However, Bush remarked, "if the Soviet withdrawal continues and our arms control efforts are successful we must plan for a different kind of military presence focussed less on the danger of an immediate outbreak of war". "We must promote long-term stability and prevent crises from escalating by relying on reduced forces", he added.

In this connection the U.S. President called for concluding the Conventional Forces in Europe (CFE) treaty as soon as possible. He said that "at the suggested NATO summit the allies need to look further ahead, preparing for follow-on negotiations after the conclusion of a CFE treaty. The NATO summit should develop the alliance's objectives for these talks."

The President said the NATO summit should also assess the future of U.S. nuclear forces in Europe.

"As democracy blooms in Eastern Europe, as Soviet troops return home and tanks are dismantled, there is less need for nuclear systems of the shortest range. The NATO summit should accelerate ongoing work within the alliance to determine the minimum number and types of weapons that will be needed to deter war."

Bush recalled that in the light of these new political conditions he reviewed the plan to produce and deploy newer, more modern shorter-range nuclear missiles to replace the Lance system now in Europe and that, following consultations with the allies, he decided to terminate the follow-on to Lance programme.

"I have also decided to cancel any further modernisation of U.S. nuclear artillery shells deployed in Europe," he added.

Bush went on to say that the United States was prepared to negotiate the reduction of short-range nuclear missile systems deployed in Europe" in a new set of arms control talks."

"At the NATO summit," he said, "I will urge my colleagues to agree on the broad objectives for these future U.S.-Soviet negotiations and begin preparations within the alliance for these talks."

He also suggested that these new U.S.-Soviet arms control talks begin shortly after a CFE treaty on conventional forces has been signed.

CIA Shifts Emphasis to 'Secret Operations'

PM0405133990 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 4 May 90 Second Edition p 5

[N. Sinyavin article: "Licensed To Kill. New Principles for CIA Activity Are Reminiscent of 007's 'Code of Conduct'"]

[Text] "Legal language is a screen which makes it possible to carry out any actions which the administration may find it convenient to instruct its intelligence service to perform." That was how former CIA Director R. Helms saw relations between the U.S. special services and Congress. His words probably convey most accurately the sense of the "new" rules for conducting secret operations against foreign states.

THE BOSTON GLOBE reported recently, citing a statement by R. Brummer, the CIA's retired chief legal adviser, that the U.S. Administration has lifted the formal restrictions prohibiting the department's agents from taking part in conspiracies aimed at deposing or assassinating foreign politicians. R. Brummer indicated that, according to the U.S. Justice Department's clarified definition, CIA support for violent coups now supposedly does not violate the ban on involvement in assassinations if CIA agents had no "clear intention of carrying out an assassination" and were unaware that this was what the conspirators intended doing. The CIA once again receives the right to "legally" encourage and support conspirators even when the planned actions will

result in violence and loss of life. The Senate Intelligence Committee is now studying the new "rules" for CIA secret operations.

The U.S. Administration's interpretation of the term "political assassination" deserves attention. This was first mentioned late last year when reports of a "legal memorandum" prepared by experts from the CIA, State Department, and other U.S. departments percolated to the press. The document noted that deaths as a result of the "use of military force on instructions from the U.S. President against another country's armed forces, guerrillas, terrorists, and organizations whose actions threaten U.S. national security will not be considered murder." It specifically explains that this definition will not encompass "accidental killing" of foreign politicians during secret operations by the special services.

It is hard to tell what there is most of in the U.S. experts' casuistic wordings—disregard for the norms of international law, cynicism, or demagoguery. In accordance with their logic, you can only reach the quite absurd conclusion that citizens of other states are "permitted" to have only the kind of leaders that Washington likes, otherwise the CIA is quite entitled to remove them from the political arena forever.

The change in the "rules" for secret operations will inevitably affect U.S. military departments. The point is that the CIA's secret semimilitary actions are conducted in close contact with the U.S. Defense Department's National Special Operations Agency, which was set up by the Congress in 1986 and is organizationally part of the structure of the Armed Forces. The agency has command over special operations forces of up to 30,000 men. They are mainly intended for intelligence and sabotage work in wartime, so only some of them are involved in secret CIA operations—the U.S. Army Special Operations Directorate and the Intelligence Support Group. Top officials in the military special services want to independently elaborate and conduct secret operations without "petty tutelage" from the CIA and other departments. The military reckons that orders from the defense secretary are all that is necessary for semilegal operations. This option was, incidentally, successfully rehearsed on the "Panama testing ground."

"Of course, our guys are terribly sick of shooting at rubber dolls," THE PHILADELPHIA INQUIRER writes, "but there is now great scope for abuse." Small wonder that many people oppose the military special services' new "approaches" to secret operations. Senator C. Grassley from Iowa, for instance, reckons that it is necessary to avoid at all costs attempts to transfer oversight functions to people in military uniform. However, the military gives assurances that a "free hand" in secret operations will enable them to react promptly to crises in various regions of the world.

The "new" rules for secret operations by the CIA and U.S. military special services are effectively the first step in implementing the intelligence doctrine for the nineties elaborated by such "think tanks" as the Heritage Foundation and the Consortium for the Study of Intelligence. The experts' main idea is that the administration must "make the maximum effort at the highest level to ensure that secret operations play a substantial role in safeguarding U.S. state interests in the next decade." This was said with equal frankness at the Republicans' last convention. Their party program notes: "The Republican Party supports secret operations as one method of implementing U.S. policy in the national security sphere... The United States must continue to offer political, military, and economic aid to friends abroad and to those people who are trying to help us in the struggle against our rivals."

Alongside the centrifugal tendencies, the mechanism for secret operations nevertheless preserves the dominant role of presidential authority. K. de Graffenreid, a leading U.S. intelligence theoretician and practical specialist, pointed out in this connection that the "development of the international situation will also require future U.S. presidents above all to make a fundamental decision on the need for personal participation in the process of directing intelligence and for the most profound and constant involvement in intelligence activity."

According to CIA Director W. Webster, the Soviet Union will be the main object of interest for U.S. intelligence in the nineties. This was confirmed by a recent report in THE BOSTON GLOBE about the U.S. special services' plans to step up their work in our country. According to the newspaper, the changes will affect virtually all forms of intelligence activity—from information analysis to secret operations and agent recruitment. Despite the improvements in Soviet-U.S. relations, the newspaper writes, "the proposed expansion in secret operations arouses virtually no objections within U.S. political circles."

It is noteworthy that R. Stolz, who had been retired since 1981, now heads the CIA Operations Directorate Secret Operations Administration. Before 1981 he led the agency's Soviet section and was considered the leading expert on the USSR. R. Stolz worked in CIA stations in the GDR and Bulgaria. He attempted to test his strength in Moscow, but he was booted out of our country in 1964.

Naturally R. Stolz' experience is now doubly valuable for the CIA—after all, the emphasis on secret operations will require a corresponding change in recruitment work. The success of secret operations, former CIA Deputy Director Ray Cline reckons, almost always depends on the presence of an effective agent network. Former chief of the CIA Secret Operations Department Hugh Howard is also of a similar opinion. He indicates that no time or effort must be spared on training agents, if necessary for many years.

"What politician does not dream of having an influential friend in the enemy camp?" Angelo Caldwell, staffer at the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence, asks. "If

any state has 'puppets' in another state, it can gain more than just influence over political decisionmaking. By using such people the essence and thrust of another state's policy can be changed and, if you want, even the state's cultural and spiritual life can be changed. ...A 'puppet' can be made of a political leader who wants to get on in the world at any price and is not particularly choosy about how he achieves his goal. If he is given aid, his potential as a 'puppet' will broaden as his political clout increases."

A. Caldwell believes that a policy is worthless if it is implemented by methods which do not guarantee the attainment of its final goals.

"Voices can sometimes be heard," he noted, "saying that secret operations are incompatible with democracy. But democratic countries that are unable to use these methods against their enemies are doomed to perish... Democracy as a system must not deprive the government of the right to carry out subversive work abroad."

These theoretical ideas are obviously already being implemented. An interdepartmental analysis of the measures which the U.S. Administration needs to take "to conduct an active policy in Eastern Europe" is being prepared under the leadership of Raymond Seitz, assistant secretary of state for European affairs. Experts from the CIA and the military special services are playing a leading role in elaborating these measures. In order not to lag behind the changes which have swept the East European countries the administration is planning to transfer an additional 200 U.S. diplomats there from their embassies and consulates in Western Europe.

Appropriations for intelligence activity by the U.S. special services have been allocated in line with the plans. According to official budget headings, hundreds of millions of dollars are allocated each year for secret operations alone. Construction of new buildings for the special services has also begun.

Large sums are being spent on equipping the special services with state-of-the-art technology. West Germany's DER SPIEGEL wrote that "never before in the history of mankind has any single power succeeded in creating anything of the kind—to eavesdrop throughout the globe. Everything is taped—the conversations of presidents, ministers, and kings, the drunken burblings of generals, and the whispering of ambassadors." With the KH-11 spy satellite you can tell one mullah in Tehran from another by the length of his beard and read automobile license plates. Moscow and Leningrad cab drivers' radio conversations can be monitored from the NSA base in Turkey.

China

Taipei Students Demonstrate Against Decision

OW0605095990 Moscow International Service in Mandarin 0200 GMT 6 May 90

[Text] The situation in Taipei remains tense.

The tension was triggered by the appointment of General Hao Pei-tsun as the head of government in Taiwan. Before his current appointment, Hao had served as Taiwan's defense minister.

College students in Taipei have demonstrated for three consecutive days to protest this decision of President Li Teng-hui's. They say that the appointment of a military man as the head of government will bring about a more severe system in Taiwan.

Approximately 500,000 [wu shi wan] students have been parading in the Central Park [as heard] to voice their protest. A day before, students stormed the Legislative Yuan and clashed with police. The ruling Kuomintang in Taiwan, however, plans to launch a propaganda campaign to support Hao Pei-tsun's appointment.

Journalist Morozov Recounts Li Peng Interview

90UF0070B Moscow ZA RUBEZHOM in Russian No 14, 30 Mar-5 Apr 90 p 2

[Article by Sergey Morozov in Beijing, by fax: "A Discussion Helping to Generalize Impressions"]

[Text] Chinese State Council Premier Li Peng received a delegation of the USSR Union of Journalists at the government residence Zhongnanhai in Beijing. Upon our preliminary request, the premier agreed to answer questions during the course of the meeting posed by representatives of ZA RUBEZHOM, TASS, and a State Committee for Television and Radio Broadcasting correspondent with PRC credentials.

The delegation of Soviet journalists had almost concluded its two-week stay in China by the time of this meeting, completing a trip to the south of the country and visiting the major cities of Shanghai and Guangzhou, and the special economic zone of Shenzhen. Naturally a great many impressions were accumulated from meetings with journalists, leading officials in the localities, economists, economic planners, and representatives of the workers, peasants, and Chinese businessmen. Our group, headed by USSR People's Deputy N. Shibik, included journalists from Moscow, Kiev, Alma-Ata, and Irkutsk. All turned out to be equally interested in acquiring a deeper understanding of the reform processes today being carried out in this great neighboring country of ours, and in their prospects for the future. These reforms are not only gradually changing the vast, multifaceted Chinese society, but are also making their mark on the development of events throughout the world.

This meeting with the leader of the Chinese Government, a member of the highest leadership of the ruling Communist Party, allowed us to highlight and generalize our Chinese discussions, impressions, and observations. Even just superficially touching on the realities of this vast country and the lives of its industrious people—who in spite of all difficulties are steadfastly paving their own road to a new life, to socialism—we left the PRC

convinced that it was critically necessary to further develop cooperation and friendly, good-neighborly relations between our two countries and peoples, a conviction that grew stronger over the course of our visit. I believe that inherent in this—and forgive me in my use of "flowery style"—is state, political, and social need.

I asked Premier Li Peng how he would evaluate the state of Soviet-Chinese relations and prospects for their future, in their new stage as introduced by M.S. Gorbachev's visit to the PRC in May 1989. Receiving his reply, I wanted to inquire further as to what he might say regarding the significance of the "human dimension" in relations between Soviet and Chinese people.

Alas, no time remained for further questions. But I got an indirect answer when Li Peng started speaking about his studies during the first half of the 1950s at the Moscow Institute of Power Engineering. From this point on, the premier remembered his Russian language and several times corrected the translator during the discussion. Warmly recalling his years in the Soviet Union, he quoted an excerpt from his student file—"he relates well with his Soviet comrades."

What in particular could be done today by Soviet and Chinese people to acquire a better understanding of the lives, everyday concerns, and problems of one another, to grasp particular features of the culture and historical traditions of each country and its peoples? In my view, this is particularly important for today's younger generations in the USSR and China. Our youth must get to know each other better, develop contacts, and mix, so as to learn how to live as neighbors and how to better cooperate. After all, we have now just begun to get rid of the alienation and distrust seen these recent decades. And conscious effort on the part of both sides is required to achieve this.

ZA RUBEZHOM reprinted an article in one of its issues of last year (No. 45) concerning a Chinese girl, an artist, and proposed that she be invited to the Soviet Union. The editors agreed to try to conclude this project jointly with KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA. Being in Beijing, I asked my Chinese journalist colleagues to provide assistance. We hope this modest undertaking, the idea of which is "to better know and understand one another," can be fulfilled.

Here at the very end of these notes which follow our interview, I would like to state that, upon hearing the question of the ZA RUBEZHOM representative, the PRC State Council premier noted: "There was a time when I used to read ZA RUBEZHOM regularly."

Shchedrov Comments on Li Peng's USSR Visit

OW0605085090 Moscow International Service in Mandarin 1400 GMT 2 May 90

[By station commentator Shchedrov]

[Text] Premier Li Peng of the PRC State Council visited the Soviet Union last week. Observers believe that the meeting between Li Peng and Gorbachev was the central event of the former's visit. We have reported at length on the contents of their talks and the positions of the two sides. What Gorbachev and Li Peng discussed included such questions as the essence [shizhi] of reform in a socialist society. At first glance, such a question does not seem to be an urgent one, as far as bilateral relations are concerned. In this connection, station commentator Shchedrov writes:

Moscow and Beijing had been engaged in polemics on the correct way to build a socialist society for 30 years. It was against this background that confrontation had actually taken place between the two sides. Such polemics sometimes involved third countries, mainly developing countries, on which the Soviet or the Chinese pattern had been imposed. Today, regrets have been expressed for the efforts and funds spent on such polemics. It must be admitted that such polemics are useless. Both Moscow and Beijing have had to give up their original dogmas [yuan lai di jiao tiao]. This is a sobering factor in Soviet-Chinese relations.

When Soviet-Chinese relations were normalized a year ago, both sides recognized that each side has the right to build its own brand of socialism. This principle was pointed out again at the Moscow meeting between Gorbachev and Li Peng. It was officially reported that there is no one pattern that all people have to follow in putting socialist ideas and principles into practice, and that nothing is possible without taking into consideration each country's own history, characteristics, and development level. By pointing this out, the past has come to an end; it will also be possible to prevent dogmatism from recurring in the future. Now both Moscow and Beijing are carrying out radical reforms, and both sides are seeking their own orientation. Both sides can learn from each other. However, each side should not try to lecture the other. Life has made it possible for the two sides to come to such a conclusion.

Soviet, Chinese Science Academies To Cooperate

OW0205152490 Moscow International Service in Mandarin 0100 GMT 19 Apr 90

[Report by station correspondent (Moyesheyev)]

[Text] A pact was signed on 18 April in Moscow between the Soviet Academy of Sciences and the Natural Science Foundation of the Chinese Academy of Sciences for the development of scientific cooperation. The following is a report by our station correspondent (Moyesheyev).

The signing of this pact is the outcome of the visit to the USSR by a delegation of the Natural Science Foundation of the Chinese Academy of Sciences led by Tang Aoqing, chairman of the foundation. Marchuk, president of the Soviet Academy of Sciences, met the Chinese delegation. Professor Tang Aoqing thanked the Soviet professors for

the opportunity to learn and to understand the developments in Soviet science. He also urged the Chinese and Soviet scientists to jointly carry out scientific activities. For his part, Marchuk also showed great interest in working with Chinese scientists.

After signing the pact, Tang Aoqing, chairman of the Natural Science Foundation of the Chinese Academy of Sciences, talked about his visit to the USSR.

[Begin Tang recording] I have very favorable impressions of the Soviet Union. I have visited Moscow, Leningrad, and Kiev as well as various research institutes. I am particularly pleased that the pact for scientific cooperation was signed during this visit. The implementation of the pact is aimed at promoting cooperation between Chinese and Soviet scientists. The Soviet Union is excellent in the development of basic sciences. [end recording]

On the possibility of conducting joint research work, Tang Auqing said:

[Begin Tang recording] During this trip, I have visited some institutions in the field of geoscience. The study of geoscience requires international cooperation; thus, we should strengthen international cooperation in this respect. [end recording]

There are good prospects for cooperation between Soviet and Chinese scientists. Zhou Guangzhao, president of the Chinese Academy of Sciences, plans to visit the USSR in May, the first visit of its kind in 30 years.

Northeast Asia

Government-Opposition Talks Open in Mongolia

LD0505144490 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1135 GMT 5 May 90

[TASS correspondent Kim Voldokhonov report]

[Text] Ulaanbaatar, 5 May (TASS)—The latest round of talks between representatives of the authorities and the "coalition of democratic forces" has commenced here. It is being relayed on MPR [Mongolian People's Republic] national television and radio. The new movements demand the formation of a People's Little Hural—a constantly operating parliament—and of a People's Extraordinary Council for investigation of the reasons for and consequences of the distortions committed by the former leadership of the country, and also demand that premises should be made available to the new movements, and that the MPRP [Mongolian People's Revolutionary Party] Central Committee apparatus should vacate Government House. A further demand has been added recently: that the decision of the Presidium of the MPR People's Great Hural on the procedure for conducting mass street meetings and demonstrations should be rescinded.

During the dialogue on 30 April, agreement was reached on the formation of a consultative council under the Presidium of the People's Great Hural consisting of representatives of all political parties for the purpose of formulating draft laws on the country's political structure, which would subsequently be presented for examination by the Presidium of the MPR People's Great Hural. However, the coalition leaders think that the authorities have still not responded to the main demands.

The activists of the Mongolian Democratic Union (MDU) report that, in support of the 16 MDU members on hunger strike at the administrative center of Hovsgol Aymag, sitdown demonstrations are continuing at administrative centers in a number of other aymags, and also at Sukhebaatar Square in the capital, where a group of students of the teacher-training institute have abandoned their lessons and joined the demonstrations. [This paragraph is rendered according to a TASS correction received at 1244 GMT; the original version of this paragraph differs only in that it specifies that the sitdown demonstrations were continuing "at the administrative centers of Govi-Altay, South Govi, Central Govi, and Uvs Aymag."]

The attitude of the public to the actions of the MDU members is mixed. Today "UNEN" published a letter from railwaymen protesting against the proclamation by MDU members at street meetings of a telegram allegedly received from railwaymen in support of the activities of the movement. The hunger strikes, sitdown demonstrations, and street meetings taking place in the country are condemned in reports from Hovd and other regions.

Remarks by Japanese Defense Chief Criticized

LD0405172590 Moscow TASS in English 1642 GMT 4 May 90

[By TASS political analyst Askold Biryukov]

[Text] Moscow May 4 TASS—The beat of military drums reverberated through South East Asia as Yozo Ishikawa, chief of the Japanee Defence Agency, toured the area, in what is the first such visit since the Second World War. During his speech in Bangkok Ishikawa sent his audience into a chill, whipping up fears about the "Soviet military threat".

The Soviet military presence in East Asia far exceeds Soviet defence requirements and is a major factor of instability, which impedes disarmament talks in Asia and Europe, he said, urging the Soviet Union to unilaterally slash its armed forces in the region.

At the same time, Ishikawa said the Unitd States should maintain its current presence in the region, stressing that the preservation of U.S. bases in the Philippines is the crucial security issue for Washington and the Association of South East Asian Nations (ASEAN).

Ishikawa's speech was quite surprising since few people now believe in myths about the "Soviet military threat". Moreover, progress at disarmament talks in Vienna and Geneva became possible largely due to a growing understanding of the absence of such a threat. The Soviet Union took a series of unilateral steps designed to turn the Asia-Pacific region from a region of confrontation into a region of cooperation. The United States—Japan's partner in "the security treaty"—admitted the importance of these steps, took them into account in its arms reductions plans in the region and even began reviewing its Pacific doctrine.

The chief of the Japanese Defence Agency should be aware that security, confidence-building and disarmament issues cannot be solved unilaterally. Vice versa, all those concerned should take part in solving them, including Japan with its growing military might and desire to play a major military role in the region.

Ishikawa's speech was most likely prompted by the unwillingness of some Japanese circles to change their military policy in line with current international changes and was designed to distract the people of the region from tokyo's military build-up.

Ecological Cooperation for Kurils Proposed

OW0305212890 Moscow in Japanese to Japan 1200 GMT 21 Apr 90

[Text] The Soviet Union proposed to Japan the idea of starting environmental and ecological cooperation on the Kurils and Sakhalin Island. This idea was initially proposed by Soviet Foreign Minister Shevardnadze. This time, however, Soviet Deputy Foreign Minister Petrovskiy, who is visiting Tokyo, presented it to the Japanese Foreign Ministry on 20 April in the form of a more developed, concrete proposal.

The Soviet proposal cites the following joint studies by scientists and experts of both countries: a survey on the present situation of the animal and plant kingdoms in those areas, joint academic expeditions, and investigations on the highly productive ecosystem in the Kurils.

These joint studies are also designed to prepare recommendations regarding preservation and rational development. The Soviet side thinks that drawing up methods for biodisplays regarding environmental pollution and studies on the effects of human factors on the ecosystem will form an important direction for the joint work on the Sakhalin and Kurils area.

The preparation of joint programs to monitor the environmental situation in these areas and the development of the method of notifying each other in case something unusual happens to the ecological situation will be of special significance.

The Soviet side is also proposing that the issue of establishing territories, including the seas which will be protected jointly, be studied with the maximum participation of UNESCO—the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization—the UNEP—United Nations Environment Program—and other international organizations.

In addition, the Soviet side thinks that undertaking joint work to observe the effects of the national economic complex on the environment in the Kurils and Sakhalin will become an important area in the proposed cooperation. The issue of setting up on Sakhalin a joint ecological scientific research institute where experts from Japan will work together with their Soviet counterparts will also become a topic for discussion.

In his meeting with reporters from TASS and KYODO, Deputy Foreign Minister Petrovskiy said: By submitting these concrete proposals we are clarifying that it is not time to have dialogues for the sake of dialogue.

In answer to a reporter's question, Deputy Foreign Minister Petrovskiy highly appraised the latest consultation [held in Sendai] and expressed his satisfaction by saying that it was held in a highly professional and friendly atmosphere.

Joint Venture To Assemble Mazda Cars in USSR

PM0405141790 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 4 May 90 Second Edition p 6

[Ye. Finko report: "Mazdas Are Coming to the USSR"]

[Text] The Japanese automobile Mazda will be manufactured in the Soviet Union—that was the accord reached between the Japanese and Korean firms which assemble these vehicles and the "Rozek-Kar" enterprise.

A considerable number of joint ventures have been set up of late, but not all of them are giving a good return. "Rozek-Kar" is distinguished by the fact that, without spending the country's hard-currency reserves, it deposits a sizable sum at the USSR Bank for Foreign Economic Activity every day. This promising firm is better known to Muscovites and visitors to the capital as a car rental firm. Smart foreign makes can be seen at airports and near foreign tourist hotels. They are earmarked for people with foreign currency. You only have to telephone 962-54-95 and a vehicle will be delivered right to your door. The firm guarantees the quality of its service.

But this joint venture's program does not only include car hire. It will soon begin to sell second-hand foreign makes—not only for hard currency, moreover, but also for rubles. It now has a new business: Mazda components will begin to arrive from Japan and the vehicles will be assembled in our country.

USSR's Nenashev Meets With NHK President

OW0305030490 Moscow in Japanese to Japan 1200 GMT 24 Apr 90

[Text] On 23 April, Chairman Nenashev of the USSR State Committee for Television and Radio Broadcasting, called at the Nihon Hoso Kyokai, also generally known as NHK, in Tokyo and held talks with NHK President Shima. After the talks, they exchanged a memorandum which says that cooperative relations should be expanded and that efforts should be made to promote exchange of television programs or to jointly produce programs, such as the one on the exploitation of the North Pole, in order to further promote mutual understanding between the peoples of the two countries. Chairman (Yanasev) also visited the news center and satellite television broadcasting studios.

In their talks, Chairman Nenashev and President Shima touched on President Gorbachev's scheduled visit to Japan next year. The two sides pointed out that, taking advantage of President Gorbachev's visit to Japan, efforts should be made to expand cooperative relations in radio and television broadcasting, and to further promote mutual understanding between the peoples of the two countries. The two sides also felt that it would be beneficial to step up exchange of radio reporters.

ROK-Japanese Foreign Ministers Talks Viewed

SK0405033990 Moscow International Service in Korean 1100 GMT 1 May 90

[Text] Korean children residing in Japan, who have permanent residency, are expected to be automatically granted Japanese citizenship.

In the talks held in Seoul, this agreement was today signed by the ministers of foreign affairs of the ROK and Japan.

By so doing, they removed one of the issues that caused major tension between the two countries, thus paving a way for ROK President No Tae-u's visit to Japan, which has been scheduled for a long time.

In the talks, Taro Nakayama, Japanese minister of foreign affairs and his South Korean counterpart Choe Ho-chung said that the question concerning the status of Korean residents in Japan will not be a stumbling block to the South Korean state leader's visit to Japan, which has been slated toward the end of May.

Until now, Seoul has voiced almost ultimatum statements that any high-level visit to Japan is impossible without first settling this question.

In addition, both ministers agreed to expand Korean residents' rights related to the restrictions of departure-visa validity and to permission for re-entry.

However, they failed to settle conflicting questions on the removal of humiliating procedures for Korean residents, of the fingerprinting system, and of the registration-card system, which have been established for foreigners residing in Japan according to Japanese law.

Both foreign ministers agreed to settle this issue in January next year, together with those questions on expanding political rights of Korean residents and on abolishing discriminative treatment such as recruitment as teachers of middle schools.

In addition, they discussed questions to be included in the next talks between President No Tae-u and Japanese Prime Minister Toshiki Kaifu. Included among them are questions, such as cooperation in high-tech industrial fields, elimination of economic unbalance between the two countries, and active cultural and scientific exchanges.

WPK Visitors Hold Talks at CPSU Departments

PM0405154790 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 4 May 90 Second Edition p 5

[TASS report: "Party Contacts"]

[Text] A delegation of the Workers Party of Korea Central Committee International Department, headed by Kwon Min-chun, deputy director of the department, visited the Soviet Union 25 April through 2 May.

The Korean comrades had meetings and talks at the CPSU Central Committee International and Ideological Departments and the Ulyanovsk CPSU Oblast Committee, visited historical and revolutionary sites linked with V.I. Lenin's life and work, and took part in the May Day festivities on Red Square.

Yazov Greets O Chin-u on Army Anniversary

SK0305120990 Moscow International Service in Korean 1100 GMT 25 Apr 90

[Text] Soviet Defense Minister Dmitriy Yazov sent a message of congratulations to Vice Marshall O Chin-u, minister of People's Armed Forces of the DPRK, and to the soldiers of the Korean People's Army [KPA] on the 58th anniversary of the founding of the KPA.

The congratulatory message noted that the traditional relations of friendship and cooperation between the two countries and two peoples will keep developing, that these relations will contribute to the welfare of the Soviet and Korean peoples, and that they will serve in the interest of peace and stability in Asia and the Pacific.

Soviet Veteran Recalls 1958 in Korea

SK0405133590 Moscow International Service in Korean 1100 GMT 2 May 90

[Text] In this hour we will introduce one of those who shared his fate with Korea. He was a man of the heart.

He is (Georgiy Blotnikov) who never showed any idleness, but tried to seek the truth.

He is now [words indistinct] and chairman of the Internationalist Soldiers Association under the Soviet Committee of War Veterans.

His youth was not different from that of his contemporaries. When the war began, he was a student. Then, he entered the military infantry academy in the city of (Belozerkovskiy). After he graduated from the school, he was sent to the front. He greeted the victory of the war in Austria.

A large army unit which defeated fascist Germany was headed for the East. The soldiers of the army left to return home. Many of them retired to the lives of their youth. But he remained in the military.

He learned the Korean language in the Military University of Foreign Languages.

[Begin (Georgiy Blotnikov) recording in Russian fading into Korean translation by announcer] In 1953, I was appointed a senior councillor of an advisory group under the academy named after Kim Il-song.

Our group was composed of eight men. I was in charge of the department of interpretation and worked as an adviser to the general educational department. In reality, the academy did not yet exist.

In 1953, we began to organize the academy and admitted the first students on 2 September.

I remember that Kim Il-song visited us in 1955. In a special notebook in the (Kumchil) stadium, he wrote his gratitude to Soviet military advisers for participating in organizing the academy. He said he would invite us to a ceremony to mark the 10th anniversary of the founding of the academy.

There were many things to do. We had to open a class in an empty lot. The academy named after (Frunze) sent us textbooks. I remember many Korean friends who worked with us. One of them was Kim Chong-sok. We called him (Andrey). He was the leader of the Korean interpreters. He also served as the interpreter of (Juan Nikolayevich Pandiryev), senior military adviser of the academy.

His fate was not smooth. Kim Chong-sok graduated from the academy named after (Frunze) with the first prize.

In 1958, we were told that the 250 interpreters who worked with us were dismissed from their offices in the Korean People's Army. Kim Chong-sok was included. [end recording]

In May 1957, the military advisory university was dissolved according to the decision of the Soviet Government. Instead a military civilian organization was organized. Military advisers who had worked in the DPRK were first withdrawn.

(Georgiy Blotnikov) also left Korea aboard the last train. But his rest did not last long.

In 1961, he was sent again to Korea in the capacity of a civilian military assistant. However, the most important thing in his life came about later.

[Begin (Georgiy Blotnikov) recording in Russian fading into Korean translation by announcer] In the summer of 1952, when I left for Korea by airplane for the first time with a delegation, I decided to major in the history of the Korean people's Fatherland Liberation War from 1950 to 1953.

I submitted an academic thesis on this matter in 1963. When the Military History Research Institute was founded, I worked there and continued my study on [words indistinct]. I decided to publish a list of the dead and injured during the Korean War. There were more than a few participants in the Korean war, who defended the northeast skies in Korea and China from the attack of the United States as pilots, anti-aircraft gunners, [words indistinct], and technicians.

Every Soviet family who lost a husband, father, and son must be helped to know where they are buried and how they died. This loss at a certain stage of our history was forgotten. Also, no attempt to remember it was made.

Besides this, my attention was drawn to the course of the war itself and to the Korean people's [words indistinct]. [end recording]

(Georgiy Blotnikov) devoted himself not a little to the publication of 11 volumes of the history of World War II. These 11 volumes include pages on the war to liberate Korea. This inclusion required his aggressive efforts. The reason is that (Pavel Zilin), then director of the Military History Research Institute and dean of the senior party school, was in favor of the system of bureaucratic order and was an activist who supported the Stalinist concept of historical study.

This period was the time when stalemate was at its lowest pitch. Assistants to our leaders, including historians, wrote books or biographies on these leaders. They also wrote scenarios or gave advice on the production of films. But some historians did not agree to an attempt to merely duplicate history and objected to forging nonexistent exploits of some military officers, including Leonid Brezhnev. They were destined to pay an extraordinary price. They were even expelled from the party or fired.

In the course of candid talks with (Zilin), (Blotnikov) criticized the situation within the institute. Immediately after this, he was called a heretic. Recollecting this event, he smiled a bitter smile.

Answering the question whether he was able to work easily, he said that he felt he would be relieved of his post when the publication of 11 volumes of his history of World War II were completed. He was indeed dismissed.

However, the attitude of adhering to a principle and honesty are highly appraised at all times. By taking these characteristics into consideration, participants in the Korean war and internationalist fighters elected (Georgiy Blotnikov) chairman of their association.

He was elected first chairman of the Korean War Veterans Association and then chairman of the Internationalist Soldiers Association of the Soviet Committee of War Veterans.

We met him at his residence. His house was very simply decorated. Every decoration in his house was an outcome of his labor. His desk was covered with numerous books, references, and letters from veterans.

While talking with him, we found him frequently wanted on the phone.

Though he is a retired officer, many people need him and vice versa. As a genuine historian, he is overflowing with a single aspiration for the truth. He seems to have lived a true life. What is important is that he is still a man of the heart. This is a very rare thing in human beings.

Southeast Asia & Pacific

Sihanouk's Resignation as Army Commander Viewed

BK0205124590 Moscow in Cambodian to Cambodia 1100 GMT 2 May 90

[Station commentator Aleksey Nikolayev]

[Text] Staying in Beijing, Samdech Sihanouk once again announced another resignation from his positions. This time, according to the reports of various news agencies, he resigned from the post of commander in chief of his group's armed forces. In his place, he appointed his son, Prince Ranariddh, to take command of the army.

In this connection, our commentator, Comrade Aleksey Nikolayev, writes as follows:

Looking at it from all angles, we will see that Sihanouk's latest maneuver was aimed at improving his facade and presenting himself to the world as a true political figure and not an army commander, especially at a time when neither his group nor the other two factions of the Cambodian opposition side have any pretext to boast about military victories. Following the complete withdrawal of the Vietnamese troops, the State of Cambodia has clearly shown that it is capable of withstanding all pressure put on it by the armed opposition groups.

The Cambodian problem cannot be resolved militarily. This is the opinion of the overwhelming majority of observers now monitoring the developments in Cambodia.

It is another story altogether in the camp of the Cambodian opposition groups, first of all within the leading circles of the Khmer Rouge, where hope of a military triumph is still being nurtured. For instance, the Thai press has just reported about the plan of the Polpotists to unleash new campaigns during the forthcoming monsoon season.

As for Samdech Sihanouk, it is quite apparent that he has a bias for diplomacy. As is widely known, he recently proposed another meeting between the representatives of the four Cambodian factions. And a few days ago he stated that he agreed to meet Comrade Prime Minister Hun Sen of the State of Cambodia in Tokyo in early June in order to discuss the possibilities of a political solution to the Cambodian conflict.

Obviously, Sihanouk's resignation from the post of commander in chief of the armed forces would not bring any change to the balance of forces in the Cambodian conflict. But this resignation will give him ample freedom of movement, as he gets rid of responsibility for the ongoing civil war. What is important now is to see how far Sihanouk will be willing to go on the road of making concessions toward Phnom Penh, and whether he will have enough power and desire to convince the leaders of other Cambodian opposition groups of the need to resolve the Cambodian conflict politically—especially concerning the Khmer Rouge who, as always, are most active in their role as the offensive forces and who oversee the policy of the whole opposition side.

Upcoming Hun Sen-Sihanouk Tokyo Talks Previewed

BK0605020190 Moscow in Cambodian to Cambodia 1100 GMT 5 May 90

[Aleksey Nikolayev commentary]

[Text] The recent visit to Thailand by Comrade Hun Sen, prime minister of the State of Cambodia, has been regarded by some observers as the first fully responsible stage in the effort to settle the situation in Cambodia. Here is a commentary in this connection by our commentator Comrade Aleksey Nikolayev.

At present, the restoration of peace in Cambodia depends on the Phnom Penh government and the Cambodian opposition groups adopting a compromising stance toward one another regarding the internal aspects of the settlement. It is known to all that the State of Cambodia has been calling on compatriots to reconcile and settle the conflict through peaceful negotiations. Moreover, Phnom Penh has given the United Nations an opportunity to take part in settling the conflict. All parties involved in the conflict have now placed their hopes in the UN role. However, a peace initiative from whichever side is impossible with the continued fighting in Cambodia.

The time has come for the warring Cambodian factions to reach an agreement on a cease-fire. Is this possible? Concerning this matter, observers have placed their

hopes on the meeting between Comrade Hun Sen and Samdech Sihanouk which will be held in Tokyo at the beginning of June. Following talks with Comrade Hun Sen who agreed to meet with Samdech Sihanouk, Thai leaders expressed their confidence that the two sides might reach an agreement on a cease-fire. Details of this possible agreement will be discussed by representatives of the two Cambodian leaders during their work session to be held in Bangkok in mid-May. Regarding this matter, Comrade Hun Sen pointed out that if the participants in the Bangkok preparatory meeting fail to reach any agreement, his talks with Samdech Sihanouk would be impossible.

[Words indistinct] the month of May does not seem to be an important period to decide the success of the process toward settling the Cambodian situation. This is because, in addition to the resumption of meetings among the Cambodian factions, there will be successive meetings on Cambodia among representatives of the five permanent members of the UN Security Council. Observers have pointed out the additional prospects for settling the conflict through the current visit to Beijing by Comrade Dinh Nho Liem, Vietnamese deputy foreign minister. Moreover, I would like to recall that during the recent meeting in Moscow, the Soviet and PRC foreign ministers pledged to step up efforts toward settling the Cambodian problem.

All these meetings have helped to bring about concrete changes in the settlement of the Cambodian problem.

Rogachev, Australian Ambassador Discuss Cambodia

PM0105110190 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 29 Apr 90 Morning Edition p 4

[TASS report under the general heading "Official Reports"]

[Text] On 26 April I.A. Rogachev, USSR deputy foreign minister, received C.R. Ashwin, Australian ambassador to the USSR, at the latter's request and talked with him about several aspects of a Cambodian settlement.

Near East & South Asia

PLO's Mahmud Abbas Cited on Visit to USSR

90UF0133A Moscow RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA in Russian 2 May 90 p 3

[Interview with Mahmud Abbas (Abu Mazin), member of the Executive Committee of the PLO, by RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA columnist V. Mikhaylov: "Learn To Understand One Another"]

[Text] [Mikhaylov] The program of your visit to the Soviet Union, it seems, was quite intense, judging by the fact that there were virtually no breaks in your schedule—meetings and talks went on from early in the morning until late in the evening. Could you tell us what they we devoted to?

[Abbas] We have a joint Soviet-Palestinian Commission that was created to coordinate political approaches concerning the situation in the Middle East. Its sessions are held alternately in Moscow and Tunis. Today the events in our region are developing rapidly and fairly dramatically; therefore, they require serious and thoughtful discussion.

In addition, the first-ever meeting of a PLO delegation with the Jewish intelligentsia of the USSR took place during my stay in Moscow. I cannot say that its preparation went smoothly—there were disagreements, including over the agenda. We managed to overcome them, and our dialog took place. Zionism and Jewish emigration from the Soviet Union were the main topics that evoked the sharpest discussion.

[Mikhaylov] It looks as though the issue of Jewish emigration from the USSR has never before been as critical for the Arab peoples in general, and the Palestinians in particular. What is the reason for this?

[Abbas] There are several reasons. The Soviet Union has opened its doors wide for its citizens who wish to leave the country. We, of course, do not doubt a person's right to move from one state to another. But, you see, it is namely those who for a number of years have been demanding that Moscow give everyone the opportunity to exercise their right that have now closed their doors to the Jews leaving the USSR. It is known that 90 percent of them preferred to go not to Israel but to the United States and certain West European countries. Now they have been deprived of the opportunity to choose.

Furthermore, the Zionist leaders have always nurtured the dream of a "Great Israel" and have done everything possible to create it at the expense of its neighbors' land. The state of Israel was created on 14,000 sq km in accordance with a UN decision in November 1947 by dividing up Palestine. Already a year later, Tel Aviv, having unleashed a war against the Arabs, annexed another 6,000 sq km of Palestinian territory. In 1967, Israel seized it all completely and, in addition, the lands of other Arab countries. Only two recent facts speak eloquently about whether the rulers of the Zionist state intend to carry out the demands of the UN on returning the occupied territories. Y. Shamir announced the intention to settle immigrants from the USSR on the occupied lands, which evoked harsh protests in many countries of the world. Secondly, Israel just put a coin into circulation on which is engraved a map that includes as part of the state both the already occupied and new Arab territories.

[Mikhaylov] What can you say about those who end up in the "Promised Land" from the Soviet Union? Do they find what they expected there?

[Abbas] The vast majority, of course, do not. Some of them dream about returning; others become embittered and aggressive and move into the camp of the extreme right-wingers, while the Israeli society is gradually

moving to the "left." Here I should mention the importance of propaganda. The people living in Israel see the way things really are and make use of many sources of information, while a certain part of the Jews living in the Soviet Union believe only the Israeli radio broadcasts. When they arrive, they see that they were rudely deceived by propaganda.

[Mikhaylov] The intifadah is in its third year—the general rebellion of Palestinians on the Israeli-occupied West Bank of the Jordan, the Gaza Strip, and East Jerusalem. In my view, a convincing political victory has been achieved: the struggle against occupation has attracted the rapt attention of the world community. But what are its future prospects?

[Abbas] We believe that we have achieved not only a political victory. Besides a moral defeat, Tel Aviv is suffering appreciable material losses. A sharp reduction in revenues from tourism, the need to constantly maintain sizable forces of punitive squads at combat readiness, strikes, a narrowing of the market for selling its goods—all this is a burden on the Israeli economy. The damage from the intifadah is enormous. We are also paying a considerable price in this struggle for self-determination. Our people receive much less than they should, they are being killed and thrown into prisons, and children do not have the opportunity to learn, but we are filled with resolve not to stop the rebellion until we win.

[Mikhaylov] What can you say about the position of other Arab countries regarding the Palestinian problem?

[Abbas] Only the kindest words. All Arab countries support us: some by political means, others provide material assistance. The support for our cause is unconditional and unanimous—such as it has never been before.

[Mikhaylov] What about Egypt?

[Abbas] The policy of the country on whose behalf Sadat committed treason has changed radically today. Egypt under President Mubarak has returned to the ranks of the Arab nation: He recognizes the inalienable rights of our people, the state of Palestine, supports the intifadah, and is exerting great efforts to mediate the Palestinian-Israeli dialog. This dialog is necessary: Everyone is tired of the constant tension, balancing on the brink of a new war, and the problem not being settled. I have already said that the Palestinian people want peace in the Middle East. Today we see that an increasing number of Israelis want the same thing. We need to talk to one another and, the main thing, learn to understand one another.

TASS Previews Mubarak Visit to Soviet Union

LD0405152790 Moscow TASS in English 1439 GMT 4 May 90

[By TASS political analyst Albert Balebanov]

[Text] Moscow May 4 TASS—President Husni Mubarak of Egypt is expected to visit the Soviet Union in the middle of May in what will be the first such visit in the past 18 years.

During his summit with President Mikhail Gorbachev, Mubarak said he plans to discuss international issues and bilateral trade and economic relations.

The two countries have similar positions on many international issues, including on preparations for an international conference on the Middle East.

Given international developments, the situation in the Middle East and the role the Soviet Union and Egypt play in the Middle East, the forthcoming Soviet-Egyptian summit will be one of the most important events of the year.

Notably, Mubarak will visit the Soviet Union shortly after his visit to Syria, which appears to have been fruitful.

Commenting on its outcome, the Egyptian president said it was "historic", which points to a Syrian-Egyptian rapprochement.

Mubarak's visit to Damascus was also a momentous development in pan-Arab relations—two large Arab states were able to find points of mutual advantage after a long period of estrangement, and this is very important for an early settlement of the Middle East crisis.

This happened after a recent visit by the Syrian president to the Soviet Union, which was and is a solid supporter of the consolidation of the Arab world.

This consolidation is especially necessary in the face of the obstructionist Israeli policy on the Palestinian issue—the key problem in the Arab-Israeli conflict.

After being recently asked to form a new coalition government Prime Minister Yitzhak Shamir backed down even on his own initiatives.

He stopped talking about elections in the occupied Arab territories.

Meanwhile, the Shamir Plan became a basis for the five-point Baker plan, suggested by the U.S. secretary of state to establish a direct Israeli-Palestinian dialogue.

In the end, Washington drew criticism from the international community. This would not have happened if the United States was more determined in promoting a peaceful and just settlement in the Middle East and pressured Israel instead of backing it.

Unfortunately, the United States lacks determination and consistence in their actions.

The forthcoming visit by President Mubarak to the Soviet Union gives rise to hopes for more favourable conditions for progress in a peaceful settlement in the Middle East.

Petrovskiy, Iranian Envoy Discuss Regional Issues

LD0405172190 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1611 GMT 4 May 90

[Text] Moscow, 4 May (TASS)—Vladimir Petrovskiy, USSR deputy minister of foreign affairs, today received Naser Heirani-Nobari, ambassador of the Islamic Republic of Iran to Moscow, at the latter's request. They discussed questions concerning the development of the Soviet-Iranian dialogue on questions of the political settlement of the Iran-Iraq conflict and the fulfilling of the Geneva Accords on Afghanistan, and international problems as a whole.

Commentary Notes Iran's Reaction to 'Iraqgate'

NC0405112590 Moscow Radio Peace and Progress in Persian to Iran 1530 GMT 3 May 90

[Station commentary]

[Text] The Iranian mass media have been enthusiastically reporting on legal proceedings in relation to the confiscation by British customs of eight steel pipes specially built by a British company to be sent to Iraq. The Iranian press, which was satisfied with the (?remarks) by the British customs and Defense Ministry experts that Iraq does not need these pipes for its petrochemical installations but for the construction of the largest gun capable of firing nuclear weapons in the world, has labelled this trial Iraqgate.

Our commentator writes: Obviously the label that has been picked to describe the transaction between a British company and Iraq is similar to Irangate. But the issue is not one of the label. The issue is: What is the underlying purpose?

Both the British-Iraqi deal and the U.S.-Iranian deal were carried out secretly. Both involved behind-the-scenes diplomacy and took place well away from the public eye. Both transactions are linked with sensitive issues, not only for those directly involved but for the entire Near and Middle East area. And what I mean by this is the issue of arms deliveries to this area from the West.

White House envoy McFarlane flew to Tehran in a plane filled with arms, and that in the heat of the Iran-Iraq war. It is not surprising that this meeting was regarded by the world public as a proof of the U.S. wish to exploit the controversies between Iran and Iraq and to fan the flames of the Iran-Iraq conflict. On the other hand, this was a proof for the Iranian social circles that there was a group among the Iranian leadership which was ready to come to terms with Washington at the expense of Iran's national interests. In general, Irangate displayed an anti-national policy, lacking goodwill and based on military and political ambitions.

As for Iraqgate, there are many ambiguities here. It is not accidental that Britain's Labor Party called on the Thatcher government for explanations. However, no convincing answer has been given yet on whether Iraq needs the steel pipes for peaceful or for military purposes.

But, at any rate, there are no (?doubts) that a commotion has been created around a transaction which is connected with an arms race that has been going on in this area for years. Unfortunately the positive trends that have emerged under the aegis of new political thought are progressing with great difficulty. It is because of this that there is no end to Irangates and Iraqgates in this area. And it is precisely because of this that the Iran-Iraq peace talks on a political solution to the conflict are facing an impasse. Therefore, one is obliged to conclude from all this that there is only one way out: defeating the harmful [words indistinct], and solving the differences among the regional governments through political means. Under conditions of peace and good-neighborliness, the atmosphere that nurtures Irangates and Iraqgates will be destroyed.

Iranian, Iraqi Search for Enemies Criticized

TA0505185990 Moscow Radio Peace and Progress in Hebrew 1500 GMT 5 May 90

[Commentary by Nikolay (Onyentov) "on the spy scare in the Middle East"]

[Text] Interestingly enough, the Middle East is going against the trend. While in the West there is detente and nations are gradually normalizing their relations, in the Middle East they are still looking for enemies. The latest report from Iran is that 10 citizens, all of them accused of spying for the United States, have been arrested. According to the general prosecutor, all of them will be executed within the next few days in Tehran.

Incidentally, a year ago the Iranians made a big fuss when they announced the uncovering of a U.S. spy plot. It seems that the time has come once again to heat up the same broth.

The Iranian authorities think they are very clever, but who will believe that the CIA is such a stupid institution as to have its agents caught by the dozen?

We in the Soviet Union know well what a spy hunt is all about and why the authorities declare one. Hundreds of thousands of spies for Germany and Japan were caught in this country before the war, and thousands of American and British spies were caught after the war. Of course, they were not spies, not even one of them. But this is a foolproof method to create a social climate of witch-hunts, social hysteria, and search for enemies.

And when everybody is busy looking for enemies, nobody dares say that the number one enemy is the regime. [Words indistinct] and the investigation material remains classified, as was the case in our country in the days of the Sun of the Nations [Stalin]. The timing is also (?telling). The Iran-Iraq war belongs in the past, but the social and economic problems persist. They can no

longer be eradicated through conspiracies to incite Saddam Husayn. It is hard to keep harping on Salman Rushdie, especially when the reaction of the West might be very serious. So, where is a new enemy to be found? [words indistinct] So, enemy, where are you?

Incidentally, an identical process is also taking place in Iraq. The British journalist Farzad Bazoft was accused of espionage and executed. Of course, all of this happened due to the hysterical spontaneous support for Saddam Husayn.

[Words indistinct] Both Iran and Iraq suffered terribly due to the war, and both nations are on the verge of economic collapse. Iranians and Iraqis are waiting for the democratization the authorities promised to effect after the war, but neither regime is prepared to forgo their power and solve economic problems. They simply are incapable of doing that. So what do they do? That is right, they look for enemies of the people and stick them with all the sins of the regime. The purpose is to create a climate of a country under siege, because in such times nobody dares demand economic betterment or democratic changes.

But occasionally a hitch comes up that does not fit the plans of their [word indistinct]. If one keeps giving him injections, the patient will ultimately die.

Commentary Examines Bottleneck at Oil Terminals

NC0305185690 Moscow in Persian to Iran 1100 GMT 3 May 90

[Text] According to newspaper reports, about 20 million barrels of crude oil have accumulated in Iran's reservoirs and terminals. One of the reasons for this is that the oil is not being shipped anywhere because sale to foreign countries is not bringing a good price. Let us see what has happened. We asked our commentator Aleksandr Batyev about this.

He said: The reason for the absence of a good price is that the OPEC member countries, including Iran, have filled the international market with more than the level of the demand in the past few months. According to estimates, the level of the extraction of oil in OPEC countries in March exceeded the ceiling agreed upon in last year's session of the petroleum ministers of the member countries by 2 million barrels.

The purpose of establishing a ceiling is that the supply of oil in the world market should be in proportion to the demand. However, these agreements were not kept in March, February, and January. Kuwait, the UAE, and Saudi Arabia were the least disciplined, and eventually the experts' warnings came true. The prices plummeted drastically. In the first few months of the current year, the price of oil fluctuated. Each barrel was sold at an average price of $18- $20. However, and especially in the past few days, it slumped to $14.

In Iran, it was even worse. The price of Iranian oil on the international market reached the price of $12 per barrel. Well, in my view, it is not necessary to elaborate on the possible concomitant dangers this may have for Iran. Suffice it to say that 90 percent of the income from the country's exports comes from oil. If over a prolonged period of time oil prices are maintained at a low level, it is possible that the low prices will harm the economic progress envisaged in Iran's recently approved five-year plan.

Let us see, however, how long the present situation of the international market—which is adverse for Iran—will continue. Aleksandr Batyev says that not only for Iran, but for all the OPEC members, this situation is unfavorable. It is not a coincident that an extraordinary session of the OPEC committee for control of the oil market is in progress in Geneva. Members of this organization are trying to take some measures to avert a further decline in the international prices of crude oil.

Delegation Discusses POWs With Najibullah

LD0305092890 Moscow TASS in English 0908 GMT 3 May 90

[Text] Kabul May 3 TASS - President Najibullah of Afghanistan met a delegation from the Nadezhda (Hope) People's Committee for the Salvation of Soviet Prisoners of War in Afghanistan, led by Russian People's Deputy Iona Andronov.

This was the third time Nadezhda representatives had met the Afghan leader, Andronov told TASS.

President Mikhail Gorbachev did much to help release Soviet POWs, he said.

Gorbachev helped establish channels with the Pakistani Government for direct talks with leaders of the Afghan opposition, he said.

President Najibullah offered help in exchanging Soviet soldiers for rebels in Afghan Government prisons.

"This is a sign of Kabul's goodwill in this complex situation. The Pakistani Government also shows understanding and helps us," Andronov said.

Soviet Role in Mideast Arms Proliferation Viewed

PM0205152290 Moscow MOSCOW NEWS in English No 17, 6-13 May 90 p 13

[Peter Gladkov article: "Merchants of Death. How To Curb the Weapons Trade?"]

[Text] It's an open secret that the Soviet Union is one of the biggest - if not the biggest - weapons merchant in the world. According to Western estimates, weapons account for 15-20 per cent of the USSR's total exports.

In its coverage of the issue of arms sales, MOSCOW NEWS has neglected one important aspect: the export of ballistic missiles to the Third World, primarily to the Middle East.

Instead of competing with the USA and other countries (no less involved than the USSR in the weapons trade), we could become more active in limiting the proliferation of ballistic weapons. This would be in line with the new thinking.

The Soviet Union began exporting missiles in 1961, the year it deployed a limited number of Frog-4 missiles in Cuba. By the end of 1989, the Soviet Union had sold 2,300 ballistic missiles to 11 Third World countries, particularly the Middle East.

Traditionally, the USSR has rationalized the export of missiles (and weapons in general) as one of the rare opportunities to earn hard currency. True or not, the appearance of ballistic missiles in unstable regions of the world stands to create many problems for all (including the exporter) which ultimately far outweigh any short-run financial gains.

First, ballistic missiles increase the unpredicatability of developments in the most unstable areas. Secret purchases of weapons are fully revealed when the missiles are used in hostilities. Thus, Iraq's purchase of 300 Soviet SCUD missiles in 1985 came to light when the missiles were used in the war with Iran in 1987-88.

Purchase of ballistic missiles often cannot be justified by any strategic or tactical considerations, but only by dubious considerations of prestige. When armed with conventional explosive warheads, ballistic missiles are ineffective from the military point of view. Instead, they are means of political provocation, which only adds to their destabilizing nature.

Besides, such exports result in incontrollable chains of new sales and the spread of those technologies involved in their production. For example, Egypt shared its Soviet-made missiles with other countries, after its break with the USSR in 1974.

Having received the SCUD missiles from Egypt, the People's Democratic Republic of Korea modified them and began its own pirate production in 1985. The missiles made in North Korea were then used by Iran in its war against Iraq in 1987-88. Iraq then made its own modification on that missile (with a doubled range) and used it against Iran, causing serious problems in the USSR-Iran relations.

The proliferation of ballistic weapons in the Middle East has been aggravated by the fact that the countries there want to develop their own missile-production technologies and long-range missiles.

East Europe

Soviets Protest CSFR Demonstrators' Blockade

LD0405195890 Moscow TASS in English 1943 GMT 4 May 90

[Text] Prague May 4 TASS—The work of the Soviet Embassy in Prague was paralysed for several hours today.

Protesters surrounded the embassy, disrupting a reception held by the military attache, officials said.

Diplomatic post couriers were also unable to leave the embassy, they said.

The Czechoslovak police onlooked, doing nothing to stop the action, that was held in violation of the diplomatic status of the embassy.

The Soviet Embassy lodged a resolute protest on this occasion to the Czechoslovak Foreign Ministry.

This was not the first time the Soviet Embassy in Prague was blockaded over the past few days.

Moldavian-Romanian Friendship Festival Held

LD0605192590 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1700 GMT 6 May 90

[From the "Vremya" newscast; video report by correspondent Petkov]

[Text] [Presenter] There was a friendship festival today at the Moldavian border town of Leusheny:

[Petkov] Touching meetings. Many have relatives across the border. The same language, the same dances and songs. When the decision was adopted on both sides, at the government level, to hold this friendship festival—it was called flower bridges—Mircha Snegur, chairman of the Moldavian Supreme Soviet evaluated it as a contribution to the construction of the common European home. The times of every conceivable and utterly unjustified prohibition and mutual suspicions are receding into the past. And today, as a first step toward what will be the free crossing of the Prut without visas and customs duties, nine posts were opened today through which inhabitants of the right bank crossed over here to our side. In conjunction with the Romanian side, it has been decided that the next such festival will be held on the other bank. [video shows people gathering along river and crossing bridge]

Romanian State Security Service Reorganized

PM0405152390 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 4 May 90 Morning Edition p 4

[Report by IZVESTIYA correspondent V. Volodin: "Reforms in Romania: Rebirth of State Security Service"]

[Text] Bucharest—Bucharest has announced the creation of a counterintelligence service under the auspices of the National Defense Ministry, to succeed the Securitate, disbanded after the December events. The Romanian authorities do not rule out the possibility that the revived state security organs will include staffers of Ceausescu's disbanded secret services. Virgil Megurianu, a political scientist by profession, is to be chief of counterintelligence.

Even after countless demonstrations chanting slogans ranging from "Down with the Securitate" to "Death to Securitate agents," the news of the rebirth of the state security organs was no shock to anyone in Romania. Admittedly, even now there are demands in the country to disfranchise staffers of the secret services, but they generally relate to former staffers of Ceausescu's secret police. The most despicable of them have already appeared in court.

Most Romanians tend to the opinion that Romania, like any other civilized country, needs a service capable of protecting the people's security.

Meanwhile, many people in Romania are asking: What has happened to the Securitate? Far from everyone can be satisfied with the brief official explanation that the terrifying machinery of repression no longer exists and that its staffers are now directly subordinate to the army. In the throngs of people at demonstrations some dubious type may tell you "in secret" that the Securitate has been taken under the wing of the National Salvation Front and that the government is paying former secret police agents fabulous pensions. However, against the background of the marathon election campaign now under way, such "revelations" seem nothing less than rumors deliberately spread by certain forces to excite the emotions of a crowd still haunted by the fear of "informers, agents, and investigators from the Securitate's dungeons."

One thing is true, namely that the departments in Ceausescu's former secret police which elaborated and implemented repressive actions and suppressed all signs of dissident thinking in the country were the most privileged and were among the first category of subunits. The most representative department was the Securitate's so-called Fifth Directorate. In addition to secret police subunits it included an extensive counterintelligence service which monitored all forms of socioeconomic activity. As a "police force above the police," the Fifth Directorate checked the purity of ranks even within the Interior and National Defense Ministries. Together with the Sixth Directorate, responsible for investigations, the Fifth Directorate belonged to the elite of Ceausescu's state security department. After the December events, 1,100 of those directorates' 1,600 employees were dismissed. The rest, mainly young officers untarnished by involvement in the repressions, were transferred to military units to posts where they cannot make decisions on their own initiative.

The fate of staffers belonging to the Securitate's First, Second, and Third Directorates, whose tasks included counterespionage, combating saboteurs and terrorists, preventing nationalist provocations, and safeguarding economic, scientific, and technical information, was less harsh. Only 210 of their 1,400 staffers were forced to quit the service.

The new authorities were more thorough in their cleansing of the Securitate's former regional inspectorates, whose remoteness from the center and sense of impunity encouraged those provincial "James Bonds" to violate not only the laws of the state but also of man. More than 2,000 of their 5,400 men were dismissed. The rest are being studied by the National Defense Ministry, which after checking their professional suitability, will decide on their further employment.

After a number of special subunits had been abolished I visited several Securitate "secret lairs," where I saw telephone tapping equipment, and wandered through the offices of a secret department at a Bucharest post office branch where trained personnel opened around 60,000 letters a week. As it transpired later, the Securitate's technical departments employed 1,700 people. Most of them have now been transferred to the signals troops. At least 215 have had to leave the service.

Of course, those discharged from the Securitate can expect far from wonderful salaries. Those who have reached a certain age face reduced pensions, the others, those dismissed, must look for work and can expect an allowance of 50 percent of the salary of the relevant army rank. After 3 months all payments cease.

What will the new state security department be like? Whatever else, it will not be a political department and its staffers will not be able to belong to a party or support narrow party interests. As a National Defense Ministry communique noted, the new state security service's tasks will include providing the government with information on negative processes affecting legal and economic order in the country as well as safeguarding national interests in the scientific, technical, economic, and other spheres against the actions of foreign intelligence services. By all accounts the formation of the state security apparatus itself will be undertaken by the government which comes to power in Romania after the elections.

Gorbachev, Bulgarian President Talk on Phone

LD0405153490 Moscow TASS in English 1454 GMT 4 May 90

[Text] Moscow May 4 TASS—Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev talked with President Petur Mladenov of Bulgaria over the telephone today.

They exchanged views on the two countries' social development and their bilateral relations. They particularly stressed the importance of stable Soviet-Bulgarian ties and said they were interested in their development.

Southern Forces Chief on Withdrawal Problems

PM0405222790 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 5 May 90 First Edition p 6

[Interview with Colonel General M.P. Burlakov, commander of the Southern Group of Forces, by PRAVDA correspondent V. Gerasimov in Budapest under the rubric "Topical Interview": "Trains on the Move—but Problems Remain"; date unspecified; first paragraph is introduction]

[Text] Budapest—The formidable T-64's are loaded on the flatcars, command flags waving. Another train prepares to leave for the east. These 27 combat vehicles and the battalion crews of Major Aleksandr Orgayev from a tank regiment stationed outside Esztergom are the last to leave this base of the Southern Group of Forces.

"A similar loading of equipment and personnel is in progress in five areas of Hungary," Colonel General M.P. Burlakov, commander of the Southern Group of Forces, said to me.

[Gerasimov] What words and facts would you use to describe the pace of the Soviet troop withdrawal?

[Burlakov] We are sticking strictly to schedule. By 20 April, 35 trains—each including 40 flatcars and cars—had left. That means 400 tanks and 500 infantry combat vehicles, artillery systems, 2,500 soldiers and officers, and 40,000 tonnes of equipment and material. But there is still an enormous amount of difficult work ahead, of course: We have to further increase the pace of the dispatches in order to meet the deadline of June next year.

[Gerasimov] The new Hungarian parliament and government could raise the question of changing the schedule and making it tighter?

[Burlakov] That would cause traffic jams on the roads and have a negative impact on the development of already strained Soviet-Hungarian economic ties.

[Gerasimov] Publications which could not be described as amicable toward the Soviet forces have appeared in the Hungarian press recently. What can you say about this?

[Burlakov] The presentation of information is very one-sided and unobjective. Every year, for example, we allocated more than 1 billion forints for the repair and refurbishment of the facilities we used. With these resources, 50 percent of all leased facilities were transferred from furnace heating to central heating and supplied with running hot water. Under a 1958 agreement, this work was counted as lease payment. Attempts are now being made to revise some provisions of this agreement. We have built 370 residential buildings with army funds. Seventy percent of them are based on Hungarian designs. Conjectures that these buildings are worthless are being put about so as to avoid having to pay for them, but these distort the real picture. A Hungarian commission carried out stringent environmental checks at our instruction center and tank training center near Veszprem. There were no complaints.

We would like to settle accounts as each military camp and base is vacated. There have been cases where the Hungarian side has taken over buildings, installations, or entire camps and then failed to take measures to guard them. Now various damage is being attributed to the Southern Group of Forces. That is why we are insisting on the need to settle mutual accounts immediately after troops leave an installation rather than at the end of the complete troop withdrawal, as the Hungarian side would like.

We are being approached by various Hungarian, foreign, and Soviet firms requesting that vacated premises, depots, and repair shops be made available for joint enterprises. But the army must not engage in trade. Unfortunately, the question of selling our property is being dealt with extremely slowly. But, you know, the funds that that would generate could be used for a specific purpose. As many as 11,300 families of military servicemen returning home do not have a roof over their heads.

The Soviet troop withdrawal has been intensified since the end of April. It would be good to enhance the pace and results of Soviet-Hungarian talks on the sale of property being left behind in Hungary.

Soviet Troops in GDR Assigned New Tasks

AU0205125090 Hamburg DER SPIEGEL in German 30 Apr 90 p 16

[Unattributed report: "Fearful Soviets"]

[Text] The Soviet Union no longer trusts East German military officials. Out of fear that in the wake of the rapid merger of the two German states, the West could get hold of military secrets, Moscow has now asked the GDR National People's Army [NVA] to return classified security material, and refuses to give NVA officers access to secret documents.

The GDR Navy already has had to remove from its ships and boats modern navigational and data transmission equipment of Soviet origin. According to Western intelligence services, the military electronic equipment is loaded on Soviet ships immediately after having been dismantled and is taken back to the "fatherland" (NVA lingo). The GDR Army is facing similar action.

Additionally, Soviet troops have taken over tasks that in the past were reserved for GDR border troops. Lately, Soviet troops have been patrolling the intra-German border, and Soviet reconnaissance units have been watching FRG and GDR border crossings from camouflaged positions.

Moscow's distrust of its Warsaw Pact partner, the GDR, seems to be justified. A confidential note that the new

defense minister, Rainer Eppelmann, obtained from the "Friedrich Engels" Military Academy, says that the NVA is no longer able to "contribute to defense readiness within the defense alliance."

For all their reservations about the new GDR leadership, the Soviets insist on the fulfillment of an expensive arms deal. In order to reduce their massive deficit trade balance with the GDR, before long they plan to supply the GDR Air Force with 30 highly sophisticated MiG-29 fighter aircraft ahead of schedule.

If the West German Air Force leadership had a say, the GDR's new MiG's would be scrapped immediately following German unification, except for a few units for the museum. According to Hardthoehe [FRG Defense Ministry], these aircraft do not meet Western requirements. So far, the "threat" by the MiG's allegedly immense fighting strength served as an excuse for Bonn to justify the West's "Fighter 90" billion-DM project.

Soviet Admission on Katyn Massacre Viewed

90UF0082A Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
15 Apr 90 Morning Edition p 5

[Interview with Professor Jarema Maciszewski and Academician Georgiy Lukich Smirnov by N. Yermolovich: "Katyn—Our Shared Pain"]

[Text] [Yermolovich] How do you, Professor, view the Soviet announcement regarding the Katyn tragedy?

[Maciszewski] It is of immense significance for the people of Poland. As concerns the scholarly aspect, for the first time Soviet sources have been made available to investigators and they are undoubtedly the most important in this tragic affair. But there are also the social, psychological, and political aspects which are no less important. As Wojciech Jaruzelski, the president of the Republic of Poland, said (13 April—N.Ye.), this is a permanently open wound. The truth about the Katyn crime will make it possible for the healing process to begin.

[Yermolovich] And you, Georgiy Lukich?

[Smirnov] I fully agree with the professor. But I would like to add that the announcement of Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev during his meeting with Wojciech Jaruzelski and the TASS report culminate the significant efforts undertaken by both Soviet and Polish historians who were on the commission. As far as we are concerned, the persistence of the scholars was inspired by the constant political support we felt and the desire to establish the truth and dig down to what really happened, regardless of how bitter it may be. And here I think it is appropriate to thank the workers of the USSR State Archive.

[Yermolovich] Remind our readers, please, about when and for what purpose the joint Soviet-Polish commission of historians was created.

[Smirnov] In May 1987 immediately after the signing of the Soviet-Polish declaration on cooperation in the areas of ideology, science, and culture. The purpose: To study the past in order to rid Soviet-Polish relations of any distortions or failure to mention events and everything else that would impede our further normal development. The commission's work considerably stimulated the activity of scholars in both countries. In the spirit of historical truth they clarified issues of the disbandment of the Communist Party of Poland and repressions against Polish Communists in the USSR and the deportation of the Polish population in 1940-1941. They advanced the study of the political aspects of the war in 1920 and the fates of Soviet prisoners of war on Polish territory during World War II. They condemned Molotov's statements that were insulting to Poland. They published a document entitled, "On the Eve and the Beginning of World War II," in which they formulated coordinated positions regarding a number of important issues in Soviet-Polish relations of that period. But still we must directly admit that Katyn was a stumbling block for us.

[Yermolovich] The more so for the Polish part of the commission, was it not Professor?

[Maciszewski] Of course it was. But I shall go further: The Polish public thought that Katyn was a measure of the reliability of the actions and decisions of the commission.

[Yermolovich] Georgiy Lukich, why is it that for so long the Soviet side has been unable to give a clear answer to the question of who was responsible for the crimes in the Katyn forest?

[Smirnov] That is a proper question which has been bothering broad segments of the Polish and Soviet society for a long time. But I think there is an answer to it. Even though Polish scholars have been studying Katyn for years or even decades, once the commission was created we practically began from the beginning. All we had was the document of the Burdenko commission which interpreted the events at Katyn in a certain way. They said that this was the work of the German fascist occupation troops. And there were no other documents.

A year later in April 1988 the Polish side submitted to us its expert evaluation of the document of the Burdenko commission. When we learned of its conclusions we had doubts that the judgments of the Burdenko commission were beyond reproach. But still this did not give us justification to radically alter its position. This was discussed well by a member of the commission, the Polish professor Cz. Madajczyk: I understand quite well that the Soviet historians would agree with our position when they had their hands on Soviet documents which irrefutably showed that the executions in Katyn were the work of the NKVD [People's Commissariat of Internal Affairs].

[Yermolovich] Georgiy Lukich, do you not get the feeling that the slowness in the commission's work was

largely predetermined by the excessive secrecy of our archives and the impossibility of looking through them?

[Smirnov] Well, undoubtedly. After all, you know, there was a spontaneous or, if you will, a random element in the fact that the documents turned over to the Polish side were found. Professor V.S. Parsadanova—and I must say she is a pioneer in this work, along with Yu.N. Zorya and N.S. Lebedeva—their research articles will be published in scholarly journals in the near future—well, anyway Parsadanova was working on the problem of deportation. And when she began to study the materials on the Home Army she came upon the archives of the convoy troops administration of the NKVD and the NKVD main administration for affairs of military prisoners and internees. Although we have abandoned the term "prisoner of war" since there was no war between the USSR and Poland. For already at 1600 hours on 17 September 1939 the commander-in-chief of the Polish forces, E. Rydz-Smigly, issued an order not to consider the Soviet Union a belligerent and not to offer resistance to their troops. So the documents about which we are speaking were discovered in these same archives.

[Yermolovich] I see the Professor wants to add something...

[Maciszewski] Yes. The fact is that before 1956 our propaganda supported the version of the Burdenko commission. But after 1956 we began to be silent about Katyn—it was not mentioned anywhere. Even in the encyclopedia. We did not want to print a falsehood and we were not permitted to print the truth.

I see four major research problems in the Katyn story. We already have answers to two of them. The first: when the crime was committed. All Polish sources show that this happened in the spring of 1940. Consequently, the crime was committed by the NKVD leaders—Beriya, Merkulov, and others. So far there is no clear answer regarding the fate of the Polish officers from the camps in Starobelsk and Ostashkov. And the last thing—the motive for this crime. But here we get into the sphere of hypothesis.

[Yermolovich] Georgiy Lukich, it would be interesting to know your opinion: Will the documents that have been discovered disclose the motives for what happened? What caused the NKVD to commit such a massacre?

[Smirnov] You know, you will not find any clear, unambiguously formulated motives in the documents. Although the documents are indirect, they are still fairly convincing. There is no doubt about that. The documents show that the people, by a decision of a special conference of the NKVD, were all taken from the camps and... they disappeared. All contact with them was broken—postal, quartermaster, mention in reports, and so forth. What other evidence is needed?!

Only one kind of motive comes through from the documents. In these as well as in other camps operational work was going on: apparently tailing people, studying their attitudes... And, probably, these camps somehow caused the leaders profound uneasiness at the time. Can this be considered a motive from the standpoint of common sense and humanity? Of course not. There was no war yet, and the situation surrounding the camps did not indicate extreme measures either. Therefore I agree with Professor Maciszewski that we still have to clarify the motives.

But I think a large role was played here by the practice, so well known to Soviet people, of committing violence against one's political opponents. This is approximately the same thing that guided Stalin and those closest to him, especially the immediate perpetrator of many of the crimes, Beriya, when they would physically destroy a potential opponent, even if it was not obvious that he was one.

[Yermolovich] From your viewpoint, Professor J. Maciszewski, what "blank spots" in the history of Soviet-Polish relation still await dispassionate study?

[Maciszewski] Even at the first meeting of our commission no more or less than 24 of these immediate subjects were named. It seems to me personally that, in addition to Katyn, among those that are the most difficult but undoubtedly require, as it were, complete clarification is the complex of problems of the Home Army and also the illegal actions of the services for guarding the front in certain regions even after the liberation of Poland. I wish to note in passing that "blank spots" in history are not always and not necessarily negative phenomena or regrettable events. For instance, the course and causes of the Soviet-Polish war of 1920 have been studied well enough. But it seems extremely important to me to study its consequences in the minds of Poles and Russians. For on one side of the front they were singing, "Lances at the ready, sabers drawn, and chase, chase, chase the Bolsheviks!" And on the other side, "The dirty ringleaders and the Polish pans [landowners] will remember our cavalry's sabers!"

[Yermolovich] Does Georgiy Lukich wish to add anything?

[Smirnov] I wish to say that, of course, there is still a good deal of research left to do. For instance we have not yet sufficiently studied questions of the Soviet-Polish military cooperation or the participation of our military prisoners in the partisan movement on Polish land. For we are studying the "blank spots" that were mentioned not only in order to establish the truth and not simply for the sake of some moral vengeance. The goal is much more noble. We want to make sure that nobody ever blackens our relations. There are many examples of this in the world. People who were enemies for a long time and even fought against one another are living and cooperating peacefully.

[Yermolovich] And the last question will be addressed to both participants in the conversation at the same time. Will the joint commission of historians remain and continue its work? Professor, you have the floor.

[Maciszewski] I have no authority. At the time I received it from the PZPR [Polish United Workers' Party] which no longer exits. So I am now the former cochairman. I do not know what will happen but I think this work definitely must be continued, perhaps even enlisting scholars from broader fields.

[Yermolovich] Georgiy Lukich?

[Smirnov] Indeed, the Polish scholars want to continue this work. And we want it even more. For what we are doing is not simply a matter of scholarship but of relations with a large state, our neighbor, a Slavic people with whom we have been cooperating for centuries. This should make it incumbent on us to continue the research. in what form? We have made no announcement that we have disbanded. Moreover, yesterday M.S. Gorbachev wanted to know how the work was going. Our commission is essentially academic. Apparently it should be expanded and reinforced, including with respect to its work on Katyn.

West Europe

Lithuania's Prunskiene To Visit UK 8-9 May

LD0505173290 Moscow World Service in English 1500 GMT 5 May 90

[Text] It has been announced in London that Lithuania's prime minister Kazimiera Prunskiene, will visit Britain on 8 and 9 May to meet her British counterpart, Margaret Thatcher. She will be returning from the United States, where she has been received by President George Bush. While giving his support to Lithuania's right to self-determination, the U.S. President confirmed his support for further reforms in the Soviet Union. Kazimiera Prunskiene said after the meeting that she still hopes to receive specific aid from the United States.

Yeltsin on Independence for Baltic Republics

LD0405195590 Madrid Domestic Service in Spanish 1900 GMT 4 May 90

[Text] Boris Yeltsin, an opponent of Gorbachev but a defender of perestroyka, is still in Barcelona. There he has said that he is in favor of giving independence to the Baltic Republics but—and it is an important but—in order to bring them together again in another federation or confederation along with the rest of the present Soviet republics. Ernest Blanc reports from Barcelona.

[Begin recording] [Blanc] The radical Soviet Deputy Boris Yeltsin has told the Barcelona media that in his opinion Gorbachev should not have blockaded Lithuania economically from any point of view. Furthermore, Yeltsin defended the need for an independent Russian republic to negotiate freely with the other republics which at present form part of the USSR. Boris Yeltsin:

[Yeltsin in Russian, with superimposed translation to Spanish] Russia, first of all, would sign agreements with each of the republics. The Russian Republic, as an independent state, would sign agrements with other republics, also as independent states. [end recording]

Yeltsin Leaves for Moscow

AU0505145490 Paris AFP in English 1049 GMT 5 May 90

[Text] Barcelona, Spain, May 5 (AFP)—The radical Soviet MP [member of parliament] Boris Yeltsin, who underwent surgery for a slipped disc in a Barcelona clinic last Monday [30 April], was discharged on Saturday and left for Moscow. Mr. Yeltsin arrived in Spain on April 28 to attend a conference on Europe without borders. He had to cancel a meeting with the press here after he was taken ill with serious back pain. Doctors said he could have been left with paralysis in the right foot if he had not been immediately operated on.

Mr. Yeltsin was well enough on Friday [4 May] to give a press conference, during which he said he wanted to see the KGB have less influence in Soviet affairs.

FRG Republicans Advocate 'Greater Germany'

90UF0076A Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 13 Apr 90 p 5

[V. Agayev report: "Once More the Dream of a 'Great Germany?'"]

[Text] Bonn—Germany is already united today—united in its economic problems and its concern for the future. True, these matters are still purely financial: How much should the East Germans receive for their marks? This issue is not just important for the Germans since this problem will also cost us a great deal. In particular, the question of how the GDR will meet its economic obligations to the Soviet Union depend on this.

What will the new, or, to use the words of Willy Brandt, this coalescing Germany, be like? The journal STERN selected 50 responses to this question, of which I will cite only one. Its author, satirist Dietrich Kitner [name as published], writes, not without cynicism: "The West German concerns will show the way—the GDR will become a country of low wages, an economic colony. The banks say: 'We are the people,' and then dictate their own conditions. If the word 'revolution' has been uttered it has not been said by a chancellor. Everything is simply explained: For the first time in the history of the people there have been price increases, housing has become more expensive, and there is instant dismissal..." The general content of the STERN responses is expressed in the four words of the headline: "Joy, Doubt, Hope, Fear."

Should the Germans of today be feared? In one voice the politicians are assuring us that postwar development has shown the groundlessness of that fear. But, for example, the writer Wolfgang Menge [name as published] believes

that "you can expect anything from us Germans..." And as if in confirmation of this thought, on the cover of one of the West German journals there is a photo montage: the haughty Kohl in a Prussian military helmet, and inside the journal an article to go with the picture: "The Dangerous Game with Poland." The article is about the chancellor's stubborn reluctance to recognize the border between the GDR and Poland (the border along the Oder and Neisse rivers) as the final German-Polish border. This conflict has now somewhat subsided. It was decided after the elections in the GDR to issue a joint statement by the two German parliaments, guaranteeing the inviolability of the Oder- Neisse border in the future. It would seem that this issue will satisfactorily wait its turn, but on the first day of the work of the GDR Volkskammer the notorious West German organization "The League of Expatriates" proposed that before promising anything to the Poles and the world it is necessary to hold a referendum, during the course of which the question of the ownership of specific territories should be decided—Silesia, Pomerania, East Prussia (Kaliningrad Oblast), and the Sudetenland. And all those "whom this affects," that is, not only people living on the "disputed" territories but also those who lived there previously, and even their children, should take part in the referendum. In all, no less than 13 million citizens of the FRG.

I would like to believe the leaders of the "League of Expatriates" when they talk about their love of peace and their desire to "build bridges." But how can one respond to their words printed in their newspaper SHLEZIER [name as published]: "The invented horrors of World War II live on today. Conflict between the generations is being deliberately fanned, and 'green' youth disputes with its long-suffering parents about the war and the exile." And further: "For the first time since the early fifties we have an opportunity to elect a party that advocates the reunification of Germany around its capital Berlin. That does not recognize the Oder-Neisse border as the western border of Poland. That demands the liberation of Germany from the aggressors and the rejection of financial aid from other countries. This is the party of the 'republicans.'"

And who are, these "republicans"? They want to see Germany not only united but also "great" within the 1937 borders. At least until there is a peace treaty. The Sudetenland also belongs to the German Reich. In any event, the Munich Agreement (incidentally recently condemned by the British Parliament) still remains in force to this day in the eyes of the "republicans." The "republicans'" program also contains an annotation supporting Anschluss on Austria, and according to statements by party leader Shenkhuber [name as published], it is also necessary to try to achieve the return of Alsace and Lorraine and parts of Belgium and Denmark.

In general, as they sing in the German national anthem "Deutschland from the Maas to the Memel (Klaypeyda)" remains the dream of a considerable proportion of the population. It is difficult to say how big this proportion is. Apart from the convinced nationalists and those who support the idea of "Deutschland ueber alles," all those who believe in the "iron hand" and who want "order" no matter what are joining the party. This is exactly why many military people and the police are joining the party.

Shenkhuber calls his party "the conscience of Germany," and attacks the press decisively and even aggressively for any criticism directed at him. "It is we who have started the process of reunification," Shenkhuber says. Some journalists have even remarked that Shenkhuber fears the American influence more than Soviet cannon. This fear, which replaces the feeling of superiority that Germans have toward everyone in the world, is in Shenkhuber growing into a hatred of everything foreign and foreigners in general: Russians, the French, the Poles.

Naturally, the party's popularity is growing in a time of social and economic crises. Last year, for example, before the wall came down, when the atmosphere was more heated, up to 15 to 20 percent of the population voted for the "republicans." Now, when the FRG's economic horizon is cloudless, nationalism is not especially in fashion and the "republicans" have recently suffered serious losses in the elections in Bavaria.

Striving somehow to sow doubt and fear among neighbors, President of the FRG Weizsaecker recently appealed to them as follows: "We understand the feelings with which you are observing the development of events here. We have no territorial claims against any of our neighbors." But there is no unity in the leadership. Whereas, for example, Foreign Minister Genscher prefers moderation in his predictions, the general secretary of the CDU Folker Ryuz [name as published] is predicting that "it will be a different Germany. It will be more northerly, more easterly, and more Protestant..."

There are still no concrete plans. The only thing that is clear is that things will not move as quickly as Kohl initially wanted, as he dreams of becoming the first chancellor of all the Germans. Today it is a question of state-and-legal unification no earlier than 1991-1992. But at the same time there are hopes that the development of German events will be inscribed in the history of Europe. For already within the European community preparations are under way for the creation from January 1993 of a European common market in which state, customs, and other barriers will lose their meaning.

Only this question remains open: Where will the Eastern border of this united Europe be?

IZVESTIYA Interviews Spanish Bank President

PM0405105190 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 3 May 90 Morning Edition p 3

[Interview with Francisco Luzon, president of the Banco Exterior de Espana, by A. Sychev: "Spaniards Have Come To Prospect"; date and place of interview not stated]

[Text] "We have come to Moscow with two purposes," I was told by Francisco Luzon, president of Spain's foreign trade bank Banco Exterior de Espana. "We wanted to express our readiness for cooperation. In addition in your country fundamental changes are taking place of which we have heard in Spain. We wanted to learn for ourselves at first hand of what has been done and of further plans. We fulfilled both tasks."

Banco Exterior de Espana is one of the country's largest financial institutions. It has long maintained relations with the Soviet Union. For nearly 11 years the bank has had a permanent mission in Moscow and the trade operations it finances are assessed at approximately $300 million a year.

"In my view, this alone is a weighty argument in favor of expanding our relations," Francisco Luzon continues. "The bank leadership has considered that the time has come to acquaint itself on the spot and personally with the plans of your foreign economic institutions and the prospects of the perestroyka process in the Soviet economy and to ascertain in what direction it is proposed to develop and improve financial policy in the USSR. Obviously there is no need to say what the possession of such information means to any bank. Without it no one can resolve to increase investments and consolidate his hold in a foreign market."

[Sychev] During your visit you had talks at the Foreign Economic Bank, the USSR State Bank, and the USSR Chamber of Commerce and Industry. What was their result?

[Luzon] In all three institutions we expressed our adherence to cooperation and suggested helping in resolving several problems. In the very near future a working group will examine and edit a draft document on cooperation.

[Sychev] In other words, you formed the impression that the changes in the Soviet market, favoring broader cooperation, will be implemented and the market may become less risky?

[Luzon] On the basis of the meetings which I had I formed the opinion that the Soviet Union is seeking radical changes enshrined by qualitatively new laws. These acts will make it possible to implement in practice important transformations leading to the creation of a functional, effective market in the country.

I brought from this visit the firm conviction that the Soviet leadership indeed intends to proceed along the path of radical changes in this field. I think that there is some time left until the moment when the preparation will be completed on a series of laws which will make it possible to change the economic regime in the USSR. The problem is that economic transformations are still in the process of implementation and have not been completed, yet there is so little time or patience.

[Sychev] The Soviet market is considered potentially one of the biggest. But Western capital is not eager to win it. In your view, what are the reasons for this caution?

[Luzon] The main element in the activity of an enterprise or bank on foreign soil is the question of determining dividends and profit. It is not a case of some implausible superprofits but a proper profit according with expenditure should be put at the company's complete disposal. To this should be added that the local currency should be convertible. I hope that the law on foreign capital investments will consider the interests of investors and will provide great freedom of movement for capital. Those are the two main questions for the development of mutually advantageous cooperation.

Cooperation can develop between our bank and the USSR in two directions: the financing of trade operations and the expansion of investments in joint enterprises. The bank intends to play a leading role in economic and financial relations with the USSR. We are now studying possibilities of doubling our participation in trade—to $600 million. Specific projects are still being formulated by interested companies.

The interest which Spanish businessmen have in the Soviet economy is enormous, F. Luzon said in conclusion. When a system of laws which satisfies businessmen has been approved, a new stage of cooperation will begin. Obviously, this change is close and today we have clearly been faced with two options: either observing the development of events in your country from Spain and letting slip the opportunities which are opening up or joining in right now. We choose the second option.

TV To Show Film on Kim Philby 11 May

LD0705092590 Moscow TASS in English 0909 GMT 7 May 90

[Text] Moscow May 7 TASS—The shooting of a two-part television film devoted to the Soviet intelligence agent Kim Philby has been completed, PRAVDA reports today. The film will be shown on Soviet television on Friday.

The idea of shooting "a Cambridge graduate," according to its producer, journalist Rostislav Andreyev, belongs to the KGB press bureau. The story of Soviet intelligence agent Kim Philby, who worked in Great Britain from 1934, is outstanding. Many books and studies were published about him in the West, and there is even a feature film about his exploits. But Soviet people learnt about Philby only from his little book "My Secret War," published after his death.

There is still no direct answer to what prompted an Englishman and a Cambridge graduate, who had a high-flying career in the British Secret Service, to establish contact with Soviet intelligence. It may be presumed, however, that Philby wanted to oppose the looming Nazi danger and regarded the Soviet Union as the only possible ally in this struggle.

Soviet cameramen have been to the places in Britain where Philby lived and worked. The picture draws on documents and on the testimony of Philby's relatives, son and widow. Prominent personalities in Britain and America, who personally knew Philby, spoke to filmmakers to aid preparations.

Latin America & Caribbean

Supreme Soviet Delegation Continues Cuba Visit

More on Baklanov Arrival Statement

PM0405155590 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 5 May 90 Morning Edition p 4

[Dispatch by unidentified TASS special correspondent: "To Strengthen Cooperation"]

[Text] Havana, 4 May—A USSR Supreme Soviet delegation headed by USSR People's Deputy O.D. Baklanov, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, arrived in Havana from Moscow Thursday at the invitation of the National Assembly of People's Power of the Republic of Cuba.

The delegation was met at the Jose Marti International Airport by Army General Raul Castro, second secretary of the Communist Party of Cuba Central Committee, first vice president of the republic's Council of State and Council of Ministers, and minister of the Revolutionary Armed Forces, Juan Escalona, president of the National Assembly of People's Power, and other officials. The welcoming party included Yu.V. Petrov, member of the CPSU Central Committee and USSR ambassador to Cuba.

We are grateful for the invitation to visit a splendid country, friendship with which we value greatly, O.D. Baklanov declared at the airport. He recalled M.S. Gorbachev's visit to Havana a year ago, which opened a new stage in the development of multifaceted cooperation between the two countries. We regard the Supreme Soviet delegation's stay as one more step on the way to further strengthening Soviet-Cuban ties. It is particularly pleasing that our stay here coincides with the 30th anniversary of the establishment of diplomatic relations between the Soviet Union and the Republic of Cuba, the Soviet delegation head emphasized.

This is the first visit to Havana by a delegation of the USSR Supreme Soviet of the new convocation, O.D. Baklanov went on to say. We attach special significance to the development of contacts along parliamentary lines in connection with the increasing role of the two countries' representative organs in resolving very important questions of domestic and foreign policy. A comparison of our assessments of the situation in the world and also of the processes taking place in our countries constitutes an important starting point for cooperation between the USSR and Cuba. Sincerity, openness, and mutual understanding have always boosted such a joint discussion of questions of key significance.

It is our desire to become better acquainted with your beautiful country. Although this is not the first visit for many members of the Soviet delegation, a meeting with Cuba and with its industrious, talented, and goodhearted people is always a festival. In this connection we await with great interest the upcoming meetings and talks, which will, we are sure, serve to further strengthen Soviet-Cuban friendship, O.D. Baklanov emphasized.

Delegation Visits National Assembly

LD0505091190 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1935 GMT 4 May 90

[Text] Havana, 4 May (TASS)—The work program of a visit to Cuba by a USSR Supreme Soviet delegation led by Oleg Baklanov, people's deputy and CPSU Central Committee secretary began Friday with a conversation with the leaders of the National Assembly of the People's Government. It noted the need for and mutual desire to develop contacts between the legislative bodies of the USSR and Cuba.

Juan Escalona, chairman of the National Assembly of the People's Government, acquainted the Soviet delegation with the principles by which the Cuban parliament operates and with current and future tasks to improve that operation within the framework of the process under way in the Republic to rectify mistakes and overcome trends, and told them of preparations for the fourth congress of the Cuban Communist Party.

The head of the Cuban parliament dwelt in detail on Cuba's achievements in the social sphere, including health care, where the level of development enables the implementation of an extensive program to provide medical aid to Soviet children affected by the Chernobyl tragedy, as well as to Soviet servicemen wounded in Afghanistan.

After conveying greetings to their counterparts from the chairmen of the Supreme Soviet chambers and the USSR people's deputies, the Soviet members of parliament noted that their stay in Cuba is taking place during the momentous 30th anniversary of the establishment of diplomatic relations between the two countries. In this period, Soviet-Cuban relations, which are varied and wide-ranging, have developed steadily and fruitfully. The friendship and cooperation treaty signed during Mikhail Gorbachev's visit in April 1989 was an expression of our peoples' desire to strengthen them further. This document consolidated the fraternal ties between the USSR and Cuba, their mutual respect, and equality of rights.

This gives grounds for seeing the present visit as a logical continuation of the parliamentary contacts which are an organic part of relations between the two countries. The

trip two years ago to the Soviet Union by members of the National Assembly was an important step in this direction.

The political and legal reform under way in the USSR, said the Soviet parliamentarians, is aimed at creating new and democratic institutions of power and government. An important stage in this process was Mikhail Gorbachev's election as USSR president.

Those taking part in the conversation spoke in favor of cooperation between related commissions and committees of the two parliaments and of strengthening cooperation within the framework of the Inter-Parliamentary Union.

On behalf of the USSR Supreme Soviet, an invitation was extended to the Cuban National Assembly of the People's Government to send a delegation to the Soviet Union.

Also that day the Soviet delegation, headed by Oleg Baklanov, laid wreaths at the monument to Cuba's national hero, Jose Marti, in the Cuban capital's Revolution Square, and at the monument to V.I. Lenin in the Havana park which bears the name of the leader of world revolution. Yuriy Petrov, USSR ambassador to Cuba, accompanied the delegation.

Baklanov Meets Fidel Castro

LD0605101890 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1910 GMT 5 May 90

[Text] Havana, May 5 (TASS)—O.D. Baklanov, leader of the Soviet parliamentary delegation now in Havana, USSR people's deputy, and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, has met Fidel Castro, first secretary of the Central Committee of the Cuban Communist Party and president of the Councils of State and Ministers of the republic. An in-depth exchange of opinions on the situation in both countries and in the world as a whole took place in a spirit of traditional friendship.

The report on the process of the restructuring processes in the USSR and the preparations for the 28th CPSU Congress was heard with great attention and interest. In his turn, the Cuban leader gave his evaluation of the rectification process underway in the country, which consists of a complex of measures directed at perfecting the running of the economy and ensuring sovereignty of the people. He also touched on the efforts being undertaken in the sphere of national defense.

The necessity of strengthening Soviet-Cuban firnedhsip was once again confirmed in the course of the conversation. The mutually useful exchange of opinions passed off in a spirit of exceptional amicability.

The members of the delegation has a long conversation with Army General Raul Castro, second secretary of the Cuban Communist Party Central Committee, first vice president of the Councils of State and Ministers of the republic, and minister of the Revolutionary Armed Forces. The importance of a continuous dialogue for the further deepening of the fraternal links of the Soviet and Cuban peoples was noted.

The CPSU Central Committee secretary took part in a report back and election conference of communists working in Soviet organizations and in enterprises which have been or are being constructed with the USSR's assistance. A great amount of work is being carried out in different fields of Soviet-Cuban cooperation by their efforts.

In his speech the leader of the delegation noted the importance of the tasks facing Soviet specialists with regard to all-round strengthening of bilateral relations between the USSR and Cuba. He said that this work is acquiring special significance in connection with the deepening of the restructuring processes in our country and the radicalization of economic reform. In these conditions it is necessary to concentrate the efforts of party organizations on new and more specific and effective forms and methods of bilateral cooperation.

The CPSU Central Committee secretary gave detailed information about the progress of preparations for the congress, spoke about the discussion within the party of the key documents that are to be considered by the delegates of the party forum, and answered questions.

On the same day members of the USSR Supreme Soviet delegation, representing various committees of the Soviet parliament, had meetings with their Cuban counterparts and visited a number of enterprises and institutions in the republic's capital.

Afterwards the delegation visited the Museum of the Revolution and also the Granma Memorial, where the historic vessel from which a group of revolutionaries led by Fidel Castro landed in Cuba has been installed.

On Saturday the delegation began a trip around the country, during which the soviet parliamentarians will familiarize themselves with a number of provinces of the Republic of Cuba.

Cuban Ambassador to Moscow Balaguer Interviewed

PY0405210490 Moscow in Spanish to Latin America 2300 GMT 3 May 90

[Interview with Jose Ramon Balaguer Cabrera, Cuban ambassador to the USSR, by Anselmo Septien; place and date not given—recorded]

[Text] [Balaguer] Well, at this moment, as you well know, the United States is carrying out military maneuvers in the Caribbean Sea. As a communique issued by the Ministry of the Revolutionary Armed Forces of Cuba has stated, these maneuvers are different from previous maneuvers. One of the U.S. maneuvers, Ocean Venture, is an attack and landing operation involving units such as unit 82 [as heard], which they prefer to use for this type of operation, as in their invasion of Panama. I think this unit also participated in the invasion of Santo

Domingo some years ago. They also have the 101st Division, which is a powerful division, and the 24th Mechanized Infantry Division, which is a respectable division with a significantly large number of men.

Ocean Venture is practically a drill for a landing on Cuba. They frequently carry out this maneuver in Puerto Rico, but it is exactly the same maneuver they would need to land in Cuba.

This gathering of forces is significant and cannot be ignored. They are also carrying out the Global Shield exercise, which is a strategic maneuver and could almost be regarded as a drill for an eventual world war. In 1989, while carrying out this maneuver they rehearsed a nuclear attack against Cuba, thus setting an interesting and important precedent. Moreover, they frequently carry out a defense maneuver called [name indistinct] during which they evacuate Guantanamo Naval Base. In addition to periodically reinforcing their troops, they conduct various maneuvers every year. But this time they have organized things for the three joint maneuvers to be carried out in May. This means that there are an incredible number of forces in the Caribbean and it seems like a very strange coincidence. Moreover, they are carrying out part of these maneuvers secretly.

We do not categorically maintain that they are going to attack us but there is no saying what they are going to decide to do, as in the case of Panama. This is why we have decided to carry out simultaneous maneuvers in order prepare our troops for combat and prepare our people to promptly react if they should try to surprise us with an attack. Our people are fully prepared at a municipal level, at a defense zone level, which is how we are organized. They know what they have to do, how to use the weapons they have, how to work and prepare themselves to defend the country.

Radio Program Views Soviet-Cuban Relations

PY0405165290 Moscow in Spanish to Latin America 2300 1 May 90

["Latin American Events Viewed From Moscow" feature, by unidentified announcers]

[Text] [First announcer] I would like to emphasize some events related to Cuba.

[Second announcer] Please excuse me for interrupting you, Vladimir, but as of late, the mass media—and not just in the West—have repeatedly referred to the future of Soviet-Cuban relations.

Taking into account the deep changes brought about by Soviet perestroyka, some press reports—even in the Soviet press—have suggested a revision of current Soviet-Cuban economic and commercial ties.

[First announcer] That is precisely what I wanted to mention, particularly because Soviet ambassador to Cuba Yuriy Petrov recently raised the issue during a press conference which he hosted at the Cuban Foreign Ministry on the occasion of the 30th anniversary of the reestablishment [as heard] of bilateral diplomatic relations on 8 May.

The Soviet ambassador said that not everything has gone smoothly over these three decades. There have been problems, deficiencies, and misunderstandings on some facts and decisions which have not always been correct.

However, the ambassador went on, no honest observer in the USSR and Cuba can deny the bilateral achievements.

The central issue now concerns the economic problems in bilateral cooperation because there are many difficulties in the economic area.

From this viewpoint, I believe we should take into account that a mixed commission will meet in May. The main objective of this commission will be to study the bilateral economic cooperation strategy and tactics for the next 5-year period.

As for the speculation promoted by some Western circles, we can say that there are always those who want to distort the truth and who want to drive wedges between the two countries, as confirmed during our 30-year-old diplomatic history.

I reiterate that there are difficulties, but there is also a mutual desire to jointly overcome them and to multiply the achievements like the unattached friendship and solidarity. Wasn't this friendship expressed through the Cuban aid that was extended when Armenia was hit by an earthquake, or when there was an accident in (Warkiria), or with the children of Chernobyl who were affected by radioactivity and who are now recuperating in Cuba, or through the medical treatment to Soviet soldiers in Afghanistan? And did we abandon Cubans during the countless provocations from U.S. reactionary circles, like the current U.S. military maneuvers near Cuba or the aggressions from the Marti Television?

Political & Social

PRAVDA Festival Under Way, Gorbachev Attends

LD0505133390 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1250 GMT 5 May 90

[Excerpt] We have already reported that the first PRAVDA festival is under way today at the USSR VDNKH [Main Committee for Exhibition of Achievements of the National Economy]

Over now to the Exhibition of Achievements in the National Economy, from where our special correspondent, Vladimir Koroblev, reports:

[Koroblev] The PRAVDA festival at the USSR VDNKH is now in full swing. Party and government leaders took part in the solemn opening of the festival. The opening ceremony did not take long. Comrade Frolov, PRAVDA editor-in-chief, made public Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev's greetings to the participants and guests of the first-ever PRAVDA festival. At mid-day, Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev, president of our country, arrived at the USSR VDNKH. He acquainted himself with the special subject exhibition in the central pavilion on The Age of the Newspaper Column. Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev met those taking part in the festival, Moscovites on the most varied topics. [passage omitted]

Frolov Opens Proceedings

LD0505114790 Moscow TASS in English 1134 GMT 5 May 90

[Text] Moscow May 5 TASS—Ivan Frolov, editor-in-chief of the Soviet Communist Party newspaper PRAVDA, opened the newspaper's festival at the national exhibition of economic achievements in Moscow today.

This is the first PRAVDA festival, which is patterned after those organised by the French L'HUMANITE and the Italian L'UNITA. Many other Soviet publications have also opened their festivals.

Mikhail Gorbachev congratulated participants in and guests of the festival, which he described as an "important political event in the run up to the 28th Soviet Communist Party Congress."

"PRAVDA, which was founded by Vladimir Lenin, together with the party and Soviet people has traversed a difficult road of gains and losses," Gorbachev's message says.

"The press and party journalists must renounce stereotypes and pursue an open and honest dialogue with the people, answer their needs and joys and help the man find his place in perestroyka.

"Truth alone can bring authority to a newspaper or a magazine, and make them popular and influential."

The festival's programme includes meetings, discussions, concerts by professional and amateur bands, dancing and circus performances, contests of children's drawings, a fashion show and sports competitions.

Frolov on Festival's Aims

LD0505183190 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1500 GMT 5 May 90

[Excerpts] Our country is marking Press Day today. The first PRAVDA festival, which has opened in the capital at the USSR VDNKH is devoted to this holiday. [passage omitted]

But what aim does the PRAVDA collective have in holding this festival? I put this question to Ivan Timofeyevich Frolov, PRAVDA editor in chief, CPSU Central Committee secretary.

[Begin recording] [Frolov] First of all, renewal. This means renewal in the country, renewal in the party and, of course, renewal in the paper. Times are difficult at present and a very great deal depends on the paper: How will the situation change in our country, first of all in the party? We are now in the run-up to the 28th congress and we are doing everything so the congress should indeed be a turning point and a very significant one in our lives. It should also be a turning point in a certain respect with regard to the party and, accordingly, to PRAVDA too. This is why we are organizing in such a way so that it will be a party paper at the same time as it is a popular paper. This is our aim.

[Korablev] Tell me, please. Will the PRAVDA festival become a tradition? Will it be held annually?

[Frolov] We will see how the first festival goes, but we have some hope that, perhaps, it will indeed become a tradition. You see, it is a tradition among communist and workers' parties throughout the world. They all mark their paper's festival and it is a very important political event for them. This is what we wish to do, so that it is both an important political event and, at the same time, a kind of popular day out as is customary throughout the world. [end recording]

Gorbachev Greets Participants, Guests

PM0405201990 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 5 May 90 First Edition p 1

[Message of greeting from M.S. Gorbachev to participants in and guests of PRAVDA festival]

[Text] To Participants in and Guests of the PRAVDA Festival

I cordially greet you on the opening day of the first PRAVDA festival—an important political event on the way to the 28th CPSU Congress.

Founded by V.I. Lenin, the newspaper has traveled the difficult road of losses and gains together with the party and our people. PRAVDA has become actively involved

in work to restructure and renew our society, establish glasnost and democracy in political life, and release the vast intellectual and labor potential of the Soviet people from the fetters of the administrative-edict system.

The main theme of the newspaper today is the renewal of the Communist Party and society and the consolidation of all healthy forces in the country for the triumph of the ideas of perestroyka and the principles of humane, democratic socialism. People must know that the party is committed to perestroyka and, while renewing itself, is endeavoring to guarantee all of our country's citizens a dignified, socially well-provided, and spiritually full life.

It is the duty of the press and party journalists to more decisively cast off stereotypes, conduct an open, honest dialogue with people, respond to their everyday needs and pleasures, and actively help the individual to find his place in the collective work of perestroyka. Only the truth, whatever that truth may be, can serve as a reliable basis for the authority of any newspaper or journal, and it is a condition of their genuine popularity and influence on the public consciousness.

I am confident that this work by journalists will find a response in the hearts of Soviet people.

May the PRAVDA festival be a mass popular celebration and a broad counseling session with readers on the work of the newspaper and our entire party press in the period of preparation for the 28th CPSU Congress.

[Signed] M. Gorbachev

Gorbachev Interviewed at Festival

LD0505184190 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1700 GMT 5 May 90

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Excerpt] [Announcer Krutor] Good evening, comrades, we congratulate you on the Press Day festival. Although this is a professional festival it would, of course, not exist without you, respected readers of newspapers, magazines, and books. The PRAVDA festival at the VDNKH

[S. Medvedev, identified by caption] Newspaper festivals are yet a rare event in our country, especially festivals of central publications. Despite lack of traditions, however, tens of thousands of PRAVDA subscribers gathered at the VDNKH today for the first festival of PRAVDA. They came to meet journalists, discuss serious subjects, and also to have fun. [video of festive crowds]

Today Mikhail Sergeyviech Gorbachev, members of the Presidential Council, and leaders of the party and the government could be seen among readers. So those who came here had an opportunity to speak with them and as questions. And we noticed that whatever the topic—problems of market economy, interethnic relations, or simply everyday matters—conversation was open and based on mutual trust, and we were pleased to see that interlocutors shared the mood of today's festival. [video shows Gorbachev, Lukyanov, Medvedev, Pugo, Yazov among the crowd at the VDNKH; Gorbachev autographing a copy of PRAVDA in an exhibition pavilion.]

Of course, journalism was one of the main topics for conversations with the president. People from PRAVDA, being the organizers of the festival, had the right to interview him today.

[Gorbachev] PRAVDA now provides good guidance for society, Communists, and the whole press. And it does not impose or dictate, it conducts a very direct conversation not only with the people but with its colleagues and everyone, with the whole world, something which is in the spirit of our time. I even think that the fact that PRAVDA has opened itself up for a broad circle of most different authors who represent different viewpoints is yet another feature of PRAVDA. It explores life, and in this sense, I think, such a PRAVDA can expect a bright future. At this festival, I congratulate all of you, Pravdists, and readers and you...[sentence incomplete as heard] [video sho. orbachev speaking inside an exhibition pavilion, wi.e photographs show the history of PRAVDA; camera catches glimpses of Pugo, Medvedev, Lukyanov, Yazov, Razumovskiy, Yakovlev, and other officials standing around.] [passage omitted]

Gorbachev Calls for 'Democratic' PRAVDA

PM0505223990 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 6 May 90 Second Edition pp 1-2

[Report by S. Bogatko, Yu. Kazmin, and V. Kozhemyako: "Pages Open to the World"]

[Excerpts] Henceforth this will be the tradition! The PRAVDA Festival, which began yesterday at the Exhibition of National Economic Achievements, is the biggest "face to face" meeting with its readers in the entire 78-year history of the newspaper. [passage omitted]

A.I. Lukyanov, chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet, leaders of the Communist Party and Soviet Government, and foreign guests came out together with PRAVDA journalists into the broad Central Pavilion of the Exhibition of National Economic Achievements. I.T. Frolov, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and chief editor of PRAVDA, read out the address from M.S. Gorbachev to the participants in and guests of the PRAVDA Festival and gave a speech of welcome to those present.

The opening ceremony was still continuing when Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev arrived at the Exhibition of National Economic Achievements. Immediately there were meetings with the festival's participants and guests, along with frank, cordial conversations. Mikhail Sergeyevich visited the exhibition of PRAVDA's history and surveyed the exhibits with interest. He gave an interview to a PRAVDA correspondent:

"I welcome this festival," M.S. Gorbachev said. "PRAVDA is our main newspaper. Of course, not

everyone agrees with it, but everyone makes high demands. That is understandable: The newspaper does, after all, originate from Lenin.

"When I was in the editorial office and met the collective, I said that PRAVDA must be made more democratic. I am very glad that the newspaper is becoming so. But it goes without saying that PRAVDA must of necessity be truthful. It must be critical with awkward issues, but always tell the truth.

"I am pleased that Friends of PRAVDA Clubs are now being set up all over the country and that you are holding this, your first festival. PRAVDA is increasingly becoming a real paper of the people. I was talking to some people just now and I asked them: 'Have you just come in here to pass the time?' But they replied: 'No, we are PRAVDA readers, we subscribe to it, and we have come here to meet the editorial collective. It is our newspaper.'

"I can say that it is my newspaper, too. It is from PRAVDA that I learned in my time about the events in China and the Finnish war. Our family always subscribed to PRAVDA and, when my father went away to the front, my mother and I still subscribed to this newspaper. So I have been a PRAVDA reader for 50 years.

"I think that this festival will really help to strengthen ties between the newspaper and its readers and that, after this, PRAVDA will be even more accessible to the mass readership. I wholeheartedly wish PRAVDA success. Having renewed itself in this way, PRAVDA must have a good future." [passage omitted]

Attending the festival were V.I. Vorotnikov, Ye.K. Ligachev, V.A. Medvedev, A.N. Yakovlev, A.V. Vlasov, A.I. Lukyanov, Ye.M. Primakov, B.K. Pugo, G.P. Razumovskiy, D.T. Yazov, A.N. Girenko, Ye.S. Stroyev, and G.I. Usmanov.

Ligachev at Discussion Session

PM0505222190 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 6 May 90 First Edition p 2

[Report by A. Petrushov and I. Podsvirov: "In the Discussion Clubs: What Form Should the Party Take?"]

[Text] An exhibition by PRAVDA's party life department is situated in the largest pavilion of the Exhibition of National Economic Achievements. There is a lot of food for thought in the hall. Thoughts about the past and present of the party and the state, the unresolved problems of perestroyka, and internal party life.

The tone of the exhibition is a serious one. Even the display of the Moscow satirical street poster "Windows of Perestroyka" disposes you to a serious, businesslike attitude. The visitors to the exhibition include well-known scientists, party workers, students, and party veterans. Everyone is interested in looking at issues of PRAVDA's "Discussion Page" from the twenties and today's nineties, on display here, imbibing the living breath of the era, and getting to the heart of party discussions in their historical development.

An oral edition of the "Discussion Page" took place here in the middle of the day. Its subjects were highly topical: "The Party on the Eve of the 28th CPSU Congress;" "Reading Between the Lines of the Draft Party Platform and Statutes;" "Problems of the CPSU's Renewal...." The oral edition will be continued 6 May. Participants in the discussion will talk about important questions concerning the history of the CPSU and the present day. "The Moscow Party Organization Before the Congress"—that is the subject of the discussion which the editorial offices of MOSKOVSKAYA PRAVDA and LENINSKOYE ZNAMYA will conduct in conjunction with the Moscow CPSU City Committee.

During the discussion people have shown that they are concerned by literally everything: Will the CPSU preserve the unity of its ranks, is there going to be a Russian Communist Party, and what decisions must be taken by the 28th CPSU Congress?

A particularly large number of opinions and assessments have been voiced on the subject of a multiparty system. The appearance of this system, speakers said, is a logical, natural step forward which accords with international practice. At the same time, given the highly complex internal structure of a country like the Soviet Union, it is essentially unprecedented and fraught with possible negative consequences. Consequently, the transition to a multiparty system demands strict analysis, careful thought, and responsible action. A number of speakers warned against immoderate enthusiasm regarding the "great prospects of a multiparty system." Haste and lack of circumspection in such an important matter, V. Legostayev, a senior CPSU Central Committee official, stressed, could bring society new problems instead of new freedoms.

Ye.K. Ligachev, member of the Politburo and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, took part in the discussion. [An amended version of this report carried on page 2 of Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 6 May 1990 Second Edition makes the preceding sentence read: ...Ye.K. Ligachev, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo [title as published], took part in the discussion and answered numerous, at times very pointed, questions]....

Publicist N. Morozova brought a Leninist theme to the oral edition of the "Discussion Page." Or, to be more specific: the theme of defending Lenin. She is worried by the fact that a lot of unscrupulous political schemers have appeared who want to make a name for themselves by discrediting Lenin and his creative legacy. War is now being waged on Lenin solely with the help of juggled facts, misrepresentation, and even outright lies.

The speeches by L. Onikov, a CPSU Central Committee official; publicist A. Salutskiy; V. Lavrichev, a scientist from the CPSU Central Committee Marxism-Leninism

Institute; K. Kandyrin, a party worker from Gorkiy Oblast; M. Burokyavichyus and V. Shved, leaders of the Lithuanian Communist Party (CPSU); and L. Annus, first secretary of Kalininskiy Rayon Committee of the Estonian Communist Party on the CPSU platform, were received with genuine interest. They conveyed congratulations to the PRAVDA staff on their festival from Lithuanian and Estonian Communists loyal to the CPSU platform and talked about the situation in the republics and their Communist Parties.

Amateur artistic collectives gave performances in the "Moskva" Pavilion: the "Iskra" Choir of war and labor veterans and the "Yablochko" Ensemble from the No. 2 Children's School of the arts.

Second Day of Festival Noted

PM0605200190 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 7 May 90 First Edition p 1

[S. Bogatko and Yu. Kazmin report: "Thank You, Friends! Until Next Spring!"]

[Excerpt] The Exhibition of National Economic Achievements was particularly well attended 6 May, the last day of the festival. While not very trustful of mass events, Muscovites have shown an unexpectedly keen interest in the PRAVDA festival. They put its organizers to quite a lot of extra effort at the weekend.

The festival was attended by V.I. Vorotnikov, Ye.K. Ligachev, V.A. Medvedev, A.N. Yakovlev, A.V. Vlasov, A.I. Lukyanov, Ye.M. Primakov, B.K. Pugo, G.P. Razumovskiy, D.T. Yazov, A.N. Girenko, Ye.S. Stroyev, and G.I. Usmanov. [Passage omitted] [The version of the Bogatko and Kazmin report front-paged by the Second Edition of PRAVDA's 7 May edition omits the preceding paragraph on leadership attendance, possibly indicating that the leaders listed attended 5 May]

PRAVDA Editor in Chief Interview

LD0405221490 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1700 GMT 4 May 90

[Interview with Ivan Timofeyevich Frolov, PRAVDA editor in chief, by Dmitriy Kisilev, in the PRAVDA editorial offices on 4 May; from the "Vremya" newscast—recorded]

[Excerpts] [Kisilev] We found PRAVDA's editor in chief, Ivan Timofeyevich Frolov, in the paper's editorial offices looking at the columns of tomorrow's edition. [passage omitted] Over the six months Academic Frolov has been working in this office, the principle newspaper of the CPSU has changed in many ways. The contents have become less official and it has a new format. Printing in color is to come. However, not all ideas have been implemented and the editor in chief continues to talk about the future.

[Frolov] It is necessary to create some kind of association, a newspaper, newspapers, a book publisher, and television, by the way. [sentence as heard]

[Kisilev] You want to have your own television?

[Frolov] Yes, that is the experience, generally speaking, of such major concerns and publishing associations in the United States, Japan, and England.

[Kisilev] Ivan Timofeyevich, PRAVDA is the CPSU Central Committee's newspaper. Well, if you remember the traditions for editing PRAVDA, then at one time Vladimir Ilich Lenin himself was PRAVDA's editor, and he gave attention to this newspaper all his life. He edited it, though was not a member of the staff. To what degree does the present leader of our party, Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev, edit your newspaper?

[Frolov] Well, of course there is no question of editing. He has enough to do without that. He follows the work of our newspaper attentively, but he follows it benevolently. He encourages what there is, in general, so to speak, it is only...[video pans to Frolov's desk and closes in on a dialless telephone, with a single button marked Gorbachev on it. Camera then returns to the speakers]

[Kisilev] He is always encouraging?

[Frolov] Well, I don't know. Maybe because I do not work much [as heard], but there have not been any particularly critical remarks from him.

[Kisilev] And so tomorrow at midday at the Main Committee for Exhibition of Achievements of the National Economy the festival at which PRAVDA is waiting for everybody opens. The newspaper, with whose help the world has already been turned upside down, invites you.

Gorbachev Opens Victory Anniversary Meeting

LD0705071790 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0700 GMT 7 May 90

[Text] A meeting devoted to the 45th anniversary of the Soviet people's victory in the Great Patriotic War has just begun in the Kremlin. The meeting was opened by Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev, president of the USSR and general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee. He warmly greeted the veterans gathered in the hall, those who defended Moscow, liberated Warsaw and Prague, and stormed Berlin, who together with the allies in the anti-Hitler coalition, brought the Second World War to a victorious conclusion.

Addresses Participants

LD0705100690 Moscow Television Service in Russian 0830 GMT 7 May 90

[Report from the Kremlin; from the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] [Unidentified correspondent] Heroes of the Soviet Union, holders of the full Order of Glory, representatives of the Soviet Armed Forces, and young people are all numbered among those taking part in this meeting.

In his short opening speech at the meeting, President Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev said:

[Begin Gorbachev recording] All of us who are alive are infinitely grateful to the older generations of Soviet people who shouldered the unbelievable privations and difficulties of the terrible wartime years. The lives lived by the veterans encompasses a lot: the great, the heroic, the dramatic and—there's no getting away from it—the tragic. It is thanks to their labor under arms that our mighty state was created, a state which has in great part exerted a huge influence on the destinies of the whole world. Without this feat, and without the immense contribution to the great victory from this generation of Soviet people, it would be hard to imagine us being able today, at this stage in the development of our society, to set ourselves the great tasks of the revolutionary transformation of our country along the lines of revealing socialism's potential, and along the lines of moving toward a humane and democratic society. Our victory cost us dearly. Let us honor the memory of those who fell in that terrible war, and of those whose life was shattered by the incredible strain on the home front. let us honor them with a minute of silence. [silence for six seconds]

Please take your seats.

I thank you for your contribution to today's causes. I would like to wish you all the soundest of health for many years to come. [applause] [end recording]

[Correspondent] The meeting in the Kremlin with veterans of the war and labor is continuing. [video shows the participants applauding; on the platform are visible: Ligachev, Yakovlev, Ogarkov, Gorbachev, and Ryzhkov. A shot shows from left to right: Ligachev, Ogarkov, Gorbachev, Ryzhkov, Yazov. The others identified are in motion across the screen and their final positions cannot be ascertained. Falin is visible in the audience]

Law on Division of Powers Published

PM0405133590 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 4 May 90 Morning Edition pp 1,2

["USSR Law on the Delimitation of Powers Between the USSR and the Federation's Components"]

[Text] Article 1. The USSR is a sovereign socialist federative state. The USSR possesses powers which the federation's components have jointly delegated to the USSR.

The union republics are sovereign Soviet socialist states which have united voluntarily and on the basis of the peoples' free self-determination and equality in the USSR. The union republics have complete state authority on their own territory outside the powers they have transferred to the USSR.

The autonomous republics are Soviet socialist states which are components of the federation—the USSR. The autonomous republics and autonomous entities form part of the union republics on the basis of the peoples' free self-determination and have complete state authority on their own territory outside the powers they have transferred to the USSR and the union republics.

Relations between the autonomous republics and autonomous entities and the union republics of which they form part are determined by agreements and treaties concluded within the framework of the USSR Constitution, the constitutions of the union and autonomous republics, and the present law.

Article 2. Each union republic retains the right to freely secede from the USSR. A union republic's secession from the USSR is decided on by the union republic's peoples freely expressing their will by means of a referendum (popular vote).

The procedure for deciding questions connected with a union republic's secession from the USSR is determined by the USSR law.

Article 3. The territory of a union republic, autonomous republic, or autonomous entity cannot be changed without their consent.

The borders between union republics can be changed by their mutual agreement, which is subject to ratification by the USSR.

Territorial disputes between union republics and between union and autonomous republics or autonomous entities, on which agreement between them has not been reached, can be referred, by mutual consent, to the USSR Supreme Soviet Soviet of Nationalities for its decision.

Article 4. Union and autonomous republics, autonomous oblasts, and autonomous okrugs independently decide questions of the siting of production and economic facilities and ensure comprehensive economic and sociocultural development on their territory taking into account the interests of all the peoples residing there. On questions of the utilization of labor resources and protection of the environment the republics determine the conditions of activity of enterprises, institutions, and organizations belonging to the USSR and other union and autonomous republics, in accordance with the legislative acts of the USSR and the union or autonomous republic.

In the sphere of economic and sociocultural building on its territory an autonomous republic has the same rights as the union republic, except for those that are delegated to the union republic by agreement between them.

Union and autonomous republics and autonomous entities can enter into economic and sociocultural cooperation among themselves and conclude the requisite bilateral and multilateral agreements, which must not contradict the interests of the USSR or other union and autonomous republics and autonomous entities.

Article 5. A union republic has the right to enter into relations with foreign states, conclude treaties with them, exchange diplomatic and consular missions, implement foreign economic links, and participate in the activities of international organizations.

The implementation of this union republic right cannot contradict USSR laws or the USSR's international commitments.

Article 6. The USSR, in the shape of its supreme organs of state power and administration, has exclusive authority:

1) to adopt the USSR Constitution and amend and amplify it and adopt decisions on holding referendums on questions that relate to the powers of the USSR;

2) to admit new union republics to the USSR and approve the formation of new and alteration of the status of existing autonomous republics, autonomous oblasts, or autonomous okrugs;

3) to resolve disputes between union republics and between union and autonomous republics or autonomous entities in the event of their appealing to USSR organs in that connection;

4) to determine the USSR state border and its regime;

5) to organize and regulate the activities of USSR organs of state power and administration;

6) to draw up, approve, and implement the union budget and establish a system of USSR state banks, a single monetary system, and national taxes and levies;

7) to elaborate the prospects for the country's socioeconomic development and draw up and implement national programs;

8) to grant USSR state loans and economic aid to foreign states and conclude agreements on state loans and credits to be received by the USSR from foreign sources;

9) to control railroad, air, sea, and main pipeline transport, defense facilities, space research, the USSR Unified Energy System, national systems of communications and information, and also facilities in the category of national state property in accordance with USSR legislation and USSR and union republic agreements, to regulate the production, storage, and use of fissionable materials;

10) to make USSR foreign policy and conclude USSR international treaties and represent the USSR in international relations;

11) to decide questions of war and peace, protect the sovereignty and territorial integrity of the USSR, protect the USSR state border, establish the organizational principles of customs activity on the basis of a unified customs territory, customs duty, and customs charges;

12) to organize defense, lead the USSR Armed Forces, border, internal, and railroad troops, and safeguard USSR state security;

13) to form USSR courts and establish a single system of prosecutor's supervision in the USSR.

Article 7. The powers of the USSR envisaged by Article 6 of the present Law cannot be widened without the consent of the federation's components.

Article 8. In spheres of joint authority between the USSR and the union republics, the USSR supreme organs of power and administration are delegated:

1) to establish the fundamentals of the legal status of Soviet citizens and their public associations and protect the rights and freedoms of USSR citizens wherever they live;

2) to establish the general principles of the legal status of autonomous republics, autonomous entities, and also national administrative-territorial units; delimit powers between union and autonomous republics and autonomous entities; determine the general principles of local self-government and local economic organization;

3) to establish the fundamentals of civil, land, forestry, water, mineral, criminal, penal, financial, and labor legislation, and legislation on social security, on public education, on health, on the protection of the environment, on administrative offenses, and on judicial administration and judicial proceedings;

4) to establish the legal fundamentals ensuring the functioning of a union-wide market and its protection in the interests of all the republics;

5) to determine general financial and credit policy and the fundamentals of pricing;

6) to establish the general principles of policy in the sphere of the utilization of labor resources, pay, and labor protection;

7) to direct, coordinate, and encourage the development of culture and education, scientific research and scientific and technical progress;

8) to implement overall leadership of the protection of public order and the fight against crime;

9) to establish the general procedure for mutual relations between union republics and foreign states and international organizations and implement overall leadership of foreign economic activities;

10) to establish the legal status of foreign citizens and people without citizenship in the USSR;

11) to ensure observance of the USSR Constitution throughout the territory of the USSR.

Article 9. By concluding an agreement with a union republic the USSR can delegate to it the exercise of certain USSR powers on its territory.

By concluding an agreement with the USSR a union republic can delegate to it certain powers that belong to it (the union republic).

Article 10. In cases where a particular question relating to a sphere of joint authority betweeen the USSR and the union republics is not resolved by a USSR law, the union republic has the right to independently implement legislative regulation in the relevant sphere. Questions of autonomous republics' and autonomous entities' authority are regulated by agreement with them.

Article 11. The USSR Constitution, USSR laws, and others acts by USSR supreme organs of state power and administration are binding throughout the territory of the USSR. If the constitution of a union or autonomous republic contradicts the USSR Constitution the USSR Constitution applies. If laws or other acts by union or autonomous republics' supreme organs of state power contradict the USSR Constitution, USSR laws, or other acts by USSR supreme organs of state power the acts issued by the corresponding USSR organs apply.

USSR laws and other acts by USSR organs are issued only within the limits of the USSR's powers and must not violate the rights of union or autonomous reopublics.

Article 12. Differences between the supreme organs of state power of the USSR and union or autonomous republics over the legality of their acts are examined in accordance with the procedure laid down by the USSR Constitution and the Law on Constitutional Oversight in the USSR.

Article 13. Union and autonomous republics' supreme organs of state power are entitled to protest resolutions and orders by the USSR Council of Ministers if they violate the rights of a union or autonomous republic. Disputes are settled by the USSR Supreme Soviet.

Union and autonomous republics' supreme organs of state power are entitled to suspend the action on their territory of acts by USSR ministries, state committees, or departments if they violate the legislation of the USSR or the corresponding union or autonomous republic, informing the USSR Council of Ministers of this. The dispute is settled by the USSR Supreme Soviet if the act by the corresponding USSR organ has been suspended by a union or autonomous republic's Supreme Soviet, or it is settled by the USSR Council of Ministers if the act by the corresponding USSR organ has been suspended by a union or autonomous republic's Council of Ministers.

[Signed] USSR President M. Gorbachev.

The Kremlin, Moscow, 26 April 1990.

More on Yakovlev News Conference Remarks

PM0505225790 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 5 May 90 Second Edition pp 1,6

[TASS report: "At USSR Foreign Ministry Press Center"]

[Text] A meeting took place 4 May between A.N. Yakovlev, member of the USSR Presidential Council, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo, and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and members of the diplomatic corps in Moscow, representatives of a number of foreign firms, and Soviet and foreign journalists. It was organized by the INTERFAX news agency and the USSR Foreign Ministry Press Center.

Opening the meeting, A.N. Yakovlev said that four events now dominate the mind of the public and particularly color the course of political life. They are the five-year mark reached by perestroyka, the 45th anniversary of the victory, preparation for the 28th CPSU Congress, and the transition to a market economy.

A great deal of what will determine the civilization aspect of our future development has been invested in perestroyka in the time that has passed since April 1985. Freedom, humanism, democracy, the dignity of the individual, the priority of culture: These are all cardinal changes of a historic nature. Whatever difficulties and dangers we may now be experiencing, there is every reason to look to the future with optimism and confidently work toward that future. Perestroyka should really be gauged not only from April 1985 but also from June 1987 and 1988, when the main reforms were formulated and, therefore, begun: economic reform and the reform of the political system. They are now in action and perestroyka is following the true path.

The introduction of a market economy will be a historic step. It is both necessary and inevitable as the completion of economic reform. It would be shortsighted and, in fact, impossible to embark on a path of "shock treatment." We must make gradual, properly considered progress toward a market economy, with clearly defined priorities at every stage. Much in this respect is still in the process of discussion and quest. But it is clear that the aim of transferring to a market economy is to improve the people's quality of life—otherwise there would be no sense in making this transition. A market economy will make it possible to decisively improve the economy's blood circulation and enhance people's standard of living. The consolidation of political and economic reforms—the breach between which is now causing destabilization in society—will change the situation in the country, ease tension, lower the level of intolerance, and narrow the possibilities for action by "ultras" on both right and left.

The approaching 45th anniversary of our victory also provides great food for thought. When this victory had been achieved, every country said just one thing: The last war must be the last. Europe and the rest of the world

must finally acquire reliable security structures. It seems that only now have we seriously approached the possibility of putting these hopes into practice. We have all reached today's dialogue, Yakovlev continued, the new thinking, and its first practical results via the difficult evolution of each social system and their complex, contradictory interaction. I believe that continued progress in a constructive direction will depend to a decisive extent on our combined ability to maintain this interaction. The year 1945 was one of victory for the allied powers in a military-political respect. But in a sociohistorical respect it was a common victory for mankind, because it began a long period of liberation for peoples and states, the collapse of authoritarianism and dictatorships, the accumulation of the fruits of peace and creativity, and the triumph of democracy and human rights. Mankind's continued progress and its very survival directly depend on how we are able to preserve and cultivate these highly promising first shoots. In today's integrated, increasingly interdependent world, each of its parts needs all the rest: Not only out of utilitarian considerations of security, which are the same for all, but also because of the longer-term, vital need to prevent any monopolism, as the only effective guarantee of continuing the development and progress of the human race.

The party's preparations for its 28th congress have entered their most active—essentially the final—stage. Blunt and committed debates are being held, and different, even opposing proposals are being made. The most important thing is to objectively analyze the whole experience of perestroyka and party activity in the new conditions, go to the CPSU congress without any internal split in party ranks, and make full use of the prospects for renewal now opening up. A great deal in this period will depend on every Communist's words and actions.

The participants in the meeting asked Yakovlev numerous questions. Answering one of them, put by a Hungarian television correspondent and concerning his appraisal of the May Day demonstration in Moscow, Yakovlev said that the May Day rally on Red Square had apparently consisted of two parts. The main segment was critical but constructive and determined the scale and tone of the celebration. The other part was offensive to any civilized person. The black flags of anarchists, tricolor flags of monarchists, and portraits of Nicholas II and Stalin. And what was the point of slogans like "One moment your armchair, the next—a bed of planks"? That sort of thing happened back in 1937. Or threats of a Ceausescu-like fate! Of course, there is no point in overstating the importance of attacks like these. But we also must not underestimate this attack by right-wing extremists and those who stand behind them.

Perestroyka and renewal, together with their leaders and suporters, are being threatened with labor camp beds, monarchy, anarchy, and violence. Everything new and cleansing that has entered our lives in the last five years is being threatened. Everyone who has contributed to the arrival and establishment of freedom, philanthropy, democracy, and the new morality is being threatened. By their very nature these threats and appeals indisputably show that they originate from extremely reactionary forces and movements. From those who would be more than pleased by a situation of tyranny, lawlessness, and an oppressed, submissive people. From that very past which we are now trying to shake off but which continues to pin us down by the legs. Clearly, these forces are displeased by perestroyka, cannot conceal their hatred for the democratic process, and, judging by their slogans, are prepared to use any forms of violence.

All democrats in the country, all simply normal, decent people with common sense must react to what is happening, be on their guard, and perceive the very real danger. They must show that, in conditions of the individual's greater sense of dignity and freedom, the really healthy segment of society is able to rebuff reactionaries. A.N. Yakovlev also answered other questions.

Yakovlev Discusses Extremists at INTERFAX Club

LD0405195990 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1700 GMT 4 May 90

[Remarks by CPSU Central Committee Politburo member Aleksandr Yakovlev, member of the Presidential Council, at a press conference given at the first sitting of the INTERFAX Club at the Foreign Ministry Press Center in Moscow on 4 May—recorded; from the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] [Announcer] The event we are now going to tell you about is interesting in itself but has, at the same time, become the pretext for a serious conversation about what is happening in our country.

[Unidentified correspondent] INTERFAX: this is the name of a new and independent news agency set up by the Gosteleradio [State Committee for Television and Radio Broadcasting] and a joint Soviet-French-Italian company, Interquadro. The first sitting of the INTERFAX Club organized by the agency was held in Moscow today. It is intended that the eminent politicans and public figures of our country should meet representaives of the press in an informal and friendly atmosphere at the club and, underscoring the level of these meetings, it was Aleksandr Nikolayevich Yakovlev who talked to journalists today. He drew the journalists' attention to the most important events that determine our domestic and international life. These are above all the fifth anniversary of perestroyka and, as Aleksandr Nikolayevich stressed, whatever the difficulties and dangers we are now experiencing, perestroyka is on the right road. In this connection, Aleksandr Nikolayevich assessed the development of a draft for the country's transition to a market economy as a step of historical significance. He gave frank and detailed answers to all the journalists' questions, even the most trenchant ones. These included a question about the May Day parades in Red Square.

[Yakovlev] It is my personal feeling that in what was, overall, a new, and if you like, unofficial and therefore particularly ingenuous demonstration, there were effectively two diametrically opposed parts. The basic part of the May Day festivies, which determined the scale and tone, was critical but constructive in its basic content. As for the other part, I actually thought at first that people in fancy costume had gone through the square, as they used to at fairs and rural festivals in Old Russia. But no, it turned out that they were definitely not in fancy dress, as the black flag of the anarchists could be glimpsed, as could the monarchist's tricolor, portraits of Nicholas II, portraits of Stalin, and even such slogans as, say, 'Out of their offices into the prisons!'—we've had that one before, that was around in 1937—or threatening to mete out a fate similar to that of Ceausescu. I would like to emphasize categorically that slogans and banners like these would, even if they were true, be seen as offensive and provocative in any civilized country. Of course, the significance of such appearances should not be exaggerated—nor, however, should manifestations of this kind be understimated or passed over. It is my own conviction that this was a sorties by the ultra-right and those who are behind them. It is quite impermissible for us, with our difficult and tragic history, that someone should want to turn history back and thereby into the abyss.

Who were the slogans and appeals aimed at? Who is threatened with prison cells, monarchy, anarchy, etc.? Perestroyka, renewal, and their leaders and supporters, those who have rid our people of fear. They would, evidently, like to see everything new that has entered our lives in the last five years on prison bunks or better still, dead and gone. [Moscow Radio at 1215 GMT on 6 May adds the following passage: They would like to see the people who helped bring about the advent and consolidation of freedom, love of fellow men, democracy, a new morality, and new ideals put in precisely the same place. Everything in these slogans irrefutably shows that they come from ultra-reactionary and ultra-conservative forces and movements, from those who would clearly be more than happy to see an atmosphere of arbitrariness and lawlessness, to see the people downtrodden and put in their place like slaves.] I understand that these forces are not happy with perestroyka today, that they cannot conceal their hatred for the democratic process and are ready, to judge from their own slogans, for any kind of violence. I personally believe that all democrats in the country, all simply normal, decent and right- thinking people, should respond to what has happened, should pay attention, be aware of what is a very real danger and then show that under conditions of an increased sense of man's worth and freedom, the truly healthy part of society is capable of a correct assessment of the schemes of the forces of reaction and their actions, because these "ultras" that have crawled out of the woodwork graphically show us all just what past we are trying to get away from and, at the other end of the scale, the kind of future they would like to see for Soviet people. Therefore, in answer to the question, I would say: Yes, the leadership did leave the rostrum and did so for political reasons, categorically disagreeing with the position—the ultra-right-wing, conservative position—which was expressed by those who had come onto the square.

[Announcer] This topic will be continued today in a speech by Bakatin, USSR minister of internal affairs. This will be broadcast after our program. [video shows the news conference audience; two female journalists asking questions; four people on the stage, of whom Gennadiy Gerasimov and Yakovlev can be identified; close-up of Yakovlev speaking]

INTERFAX News Agency Profiled

LD0405151990 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1321 GMT 4 May 90

[Excerpt] Our correspondent Aleksandr Korshunov today went to the press center of our Foreign Ministry. The first meeting of the club of the INTERFAX news agency was held there today. So, here are the details from Aleksandr Korshunov.

[Korshunov] The INTERFAX news agency is what is now usually called a joint enterprise. The agency appeared relatively recently, last fall. Its parents were the external broadcasting service of state television and radio and the Franco-Italian firm Interquadro. The concept of the INTERFAX agency is based on the aspiration of helping to give a better understanding of the processes taking place at present in our country and the directions in which perestroyka is moving. And the INTERFAX Club is envisaged as a place for a relaxed exchange of opinions with eminent political and social figures of the USSR. The appearance of the club is a notable phenomenon of perstroyka, a step toward greater openness.

The opportunity for those people who stand at the head of perestroyka or who have a great influence on the country's political and spiritual life to set out their private opinions will be taken as an essential condition of the club. The slogan of the INTERFAX Club includes the words: The personal opinion of the individual.

The first guest of the club was Aleksandr Nikolayevich Yakovlev, member of the USSR Presidential Council and member of the Politburo of the CPSU Central Committee. He began his address to those assembled by saying what in his view characterizes our present-day life and perestroyka:

[Begin Yakovlev recording] It is first of all the fifth anniversary of perestroyka. Contemporary science asserts that a five-year old child is an already-formed personality and that by that age everything that determines all his later life has already been laid down in his soul—freedom, humanism, dignity, and so on. If that is so, then, in my opinion, there has already been laid down in perestroyka quite a lot of things which will determine the civilized side of our development. Whatever difficulties and dangers we have undergone now, today—and these do exist—in my view, there is every reason to look

to the future with optimism. And, of course, not just to look but to work for this future.

In reality, one should start to reckon the perestroyka processes from 1 April, 1985, and from the two Junes—1987 and 1988—when the two main reforms were formulated and, consequently, began to operate, the economic reform and the reform of the political system. Are these reforms working today? Yes, they are. But the political reform is working considerably more dynamically that the economic one. A dangerous gap has formed between them which is giving rise to destabilization in society. But I continue to assert that prestroyka is on the right path and perestroyka is working. [end recording]

[Korshunov] Many of the club's guests asked Aleksandr Nikolayevich's opinion about a multiparty system in our country, the situation in the CPSU, and his attitude to the idea which is now being widely expressed of creating a Russian Communist Party [RCP]. This is what Aleksandr Nikolayevich said on the subject of a RCP:

[Begin Yakovlev recording] If one is to speak about the creation of the RCP, then here there cannot be any brief, straightforward reply. There are, of course, some considerations categorically in favor and there are no fewer considerations categorically against. There is no doubt that Russia needs more precise and autonomous state, political, and other formations. It is also correct that Russia needs autonomous actions and that it should autonomously resolve its economic, political, cultural, and other questions, particularly if one takes into account the state of ruin which has befallen Russia, not to any lesser extent but actually to a greater extent. This is also one of the arguments in favor of just this approach.

But if one speaks or looks at things in a sober manner, then of no less importance are such considerations as the integrity of the party and its unity—and here there are certain fears on this account—as well as the integrity of the state. But it seems to me that this complicated question should be resolved by the communists of Russia themselves. They are to meet for a conference on 19 June and they will decide how they are to construct their future life. And the final word, of course, is up to the communists of Russia. [end recording] [passage omitted]

Yakovlev, Sagalayev on Media Freedom

LD0405225990

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 1825 GMT on 4 May in its 'View' program carries a 100-minute program consisting of the studio audience questioning the participants, Yegor Yakovlev, editor in chief of MOSCOW NEWS; Aleksandr Bovin, IZVESTIYA political observer, and Eduard Sagalayev, editor in chief of Central Television's Main Information Department.

Asked about why the print-run of the Russian-language edition of MOSCOW NEWS is so small, Yegor Yakovlev says "so far I have endlessly appealed to Comrade Medvedev against the Central Committee's interference, which bans subscription to the MOSCOW NEWS. Any Russian reader can take out a subscription to the Arab, French, or Spanish version of the newspaper, but subscription to the Russian-language edition remains banned. We have weekly conversations with Comrade Medvedev and each week Comrade Medvedev says he is thinking the issue over. He has been thinking for quite some time, Yakovlev says.

In his round of question time Aleksandr Bovin criticizes Soviet policy in the Middle East. He says for the Soviet Union, good relations with China are even more important than those with the United States. Further, Bovin criticizes Soviet samizdat newspapers for their low professional standards. Bovin is asked "Tell us, please, is it true the CPSU Central Committee Secretariat appoints political observers?" Bovin responds, "Yes, that is true." He adds his appointment was endorsed by Suslov.

In the last part of the program Eduard Sagalayev fields questions from the audience. To the question, "On 1 May, when opposition columns entered Red Square, the relay was discontinued. How can that be explained?" Sagalayev responds, "I was instructed to discontinue the relay of the May Day procession by my immediate management; by Petr Nikolayevich Reshetov, first deputy chairman of the USSR Gosteleradio." No further remarks on the May Day relay are made. Sagalayev gives his ambivalent view of broadcasting live controversial events. A man in the audience asks about Sagalayev's attitude toward pirate radio stations as, according to his information, such a station is starting broadcasts tomorrow in Kuybyshev. A member of the Greens asks whether or not Central Television is going to cover the picketing of the Balakovo Nuclear Electric Power Station, which the ecological movement is starting on 1 June. Sagalayev promises all the help he can provide.

In a short interval a visit to the Moscow bureau of the Associated Press is shown. Director Michael Patsel and correspondent Mark Porubkanski give brief interviews describing their work.

After the interval Sagalayev elaborates on the subject of the future of television, which should be outside party control; members of any parties should not work in television at all, he says. Sagalayev says there is struggle on television between attempts to show the situation in Lithuania in an objective way and biased viewpoints; all this could be discerned if the 'Vremya' program is watched attentively, although it should be stated that to date the 'Vremya' is an official program of the government and the party.

Sagalayev is later asked, "Eduard Mikhaylovich, the people—and they know everything—say the 'Seven Days' program ceased to exist following a Politburo decision." Sagalayev responds, "Well, you know, there

are certain secrets that do not belong to me. I did not attend that meeting of the Politburo, but as far as I know—I will use such an expression—indeed, the Politburo recommended that the Sunday edition of the 'Vremya' program be restored. As a result, the Seven Days program disappeared, although it had not been banned."

Bakatin Deplores May Day 'Hooliganism'

LD0405220690 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1745 GMT 4 May 90

[Remarks by USSR Minister of Internal Affairs V.V. Bakatin, place and date not specified—recorded]

[Text] [Announcer] Esteemed comrades, at our request Vadim Viktorovich Bakatin, the USSR Minister of Internal Affairs, will now comment on the events which took place during the May Day celebrations on Red Square in Moscow.

[Begin recording] [unidentified interviewer, question recorded in progress] ...the atmosphere, the holiday atmosphere in Moscow?

[Bakatin] Yes, in general, this is a question that very many people are asking at the moment. Leaving aside the hooliganism which was staged after the end of the demonstration, it was on the whole an excellent demonstration, it seems to me—and I witnessed it myself. Not being over organized, it was carried out in a new way. It was an event at which moods were sharply expressed, if you like, and also interesting, if you like. It reflected the entire spectrum, the diversity of the moods and opinions of Muscovites. The demonstration was all right, but unfortunately there was this escapade, as I have already said.

Strictly following the line or policy of democratization, the USSR Ministry of Internal Affairs has always advocated the removal of all kinds of restrictions imposed when mass political events are held—admittedly, within the framework of the law and in conformity with certain regulations. In this respect, I must say that we expressed support for the request made by the Moscow Association of Electors and other political forces which are coming into being there, in Moscow, that they be allowed to take part, as a column, in the festive demonstration.

It seems to me that the Council of Ministers made a very good move, by recommending that both the trade unions who put forward this initiative first and the Moscow Association of Electors march as a single column through Red Square. We also supported this. But, to put it mildly, the organizers for the Moscow Association of Electors did not keep their word. They simply deceived the law enforcement organs.

After the completion of the parade, when practically all the participants had entered Red Square, a ploy was used that is not new; it is a well-tried ploy employed when people want to wreck a parade: the participants simply stopped on the square. Some of them—I would put it at at least two-thirds of the column, there were some 25-30,000 participating from the Moscow Voters' Association—about two-thirds passed normally, for all the pointed nature of their demands, and about one-third, perhaps 7-10,000, stopped at an initial stage, and held what amounted to a real orgy [shabash], which, as far as I can see, had nothing to do either with political culture or culture in general. Moreover, no self-respecting political organization should permit such things. The USSR Ministry of Internal Affairs will naturally draw certain conclusions from this. Doubtless one need not have said much on this subject, since nothing particular occurred, had it not been for one circumstance. I must tell you that, as I see it, and according to the information we have here, which can be examined, this shouting, whistling and howling by perhaps several hundred people—because not everyone behaved in this unruly fashion: this could no doubt be checked—is being presented by the organizers as some sort of colossal political victory. Literally a colossal political victory. Let us ponder how this can be a victory. If this was an act of lawlessness sheltering under deputies' immunity, what sort of victory can it be? If someone accounts it a victory that the government opened up Red Square for a demonstration by all political forces, then if victory it be, it is no doubt a victory for the government, which took a necessary step in a necessary democratic direction, but on no account for those who, as the saying goes, used this for their political...[changes thought] I would not even use the word politics here, because this was something far removed from politics and culture in general.

If you were to measure this—victory—by the number of participants, then it seems to me that the organizers themselves were very disappointed by the very low level of activity, by the very low turn-out. The number that they gathered—at all events they declared that there would be at least 150,000 people there, but there were far fewer. Maybe their sole victory was the fact that they managed to mar the end of the May Day demonstration. I will not disagree with that, but it was a very insignificant victory, that is certain.

In general, there is certainly no reason for us to use this word victory here. It was, quite simply, a very commonplace occurrence which very accurately illustrates the political level and the general cultural level—or lack of it, to be more precise—of these organizers of political forces, which are exploiting the natural and inevitable difficulties of the transitional period. They are doing all they can to make these difficulties worse, to exacerbate them. They are greedy for power, violence, chaos, and lawlessness. I am confident that genuine democratic forces, the ones that are coming into being, the real democratic forces and movements within the country, will not allow this.

But in general, this was a normal holiday. Certainly, nothing supernatural took place.

[Interviewer] Thank you very much. [video shows, about two minutes into the six-minute interview with Bakatin,

a one-minute clip of the May Day events. A general view of a crowd with banners and balloons was followed by closer shots of individual marchers with the following slogans: Moscow City Soviet and Leningrad City Soviet—Get them off the necks of the working people!; (?Hands) off Lithuania; Russian People's Front; [word indistinct] protests at reprisals against Gdlyan and Ivanov!; Leninskiy Rayon Voters' Club; Senkov must resign; KGB Pamyat (this banner had an emblem of barbed wire and a skull); Power according to merit, not allocation; Leninskiy Rayon Society of Families With a Large Number of Children; B.N. Yeltsins—Leader (?of the people); and Stop feeding the [word indistinct] divorced from the people. The yellow, green, and red independent Lithuanian flag; and black or dark blue St. Andrew's crosses on white backgrounds (presumably Peter the Great's blue saltire on a white field, in use until 1817) were shown carried by marchers, as was a portrait of Yeltsin. Many of the slogans were not legible from the shots shown. The clip ended with a more general shot of Red Square, but at no stage could Lenin's Mausoleum or the discomfited Soviet leadership be seen.] [end recording]

May Day Demonstrations Analyzed

PM0405111890 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 4 May 90 Second Edition p 1

[V. Kondakov article: "Postscript to the Holiday"]

[Text] This year's May Day was certainly unusual: It lacked excessive street decorations, ringing reports, and festive fanfares. And are all these obsolete features necessary for a festival of working people which is profoundly homespun in its traditions? Do we really want reports on successes which are modest, to say the least, and in any case are below our potential? This time we managed without the staged demonstrations where it is prescribed beforehand what toasts to proclaim and whose portraits should be carried by whom....

The sixth spring of perestroyka came to us with a May Day that had acquired its original meaning—working people's solidarity. People came out into the streets and squares following the call of their hearts. Demonstrations, this time without the former lavishness, took place in many Russian cities. This was not a tribute to traditions, but tradition itself: Everything that is just and that unites and elevates people should live on. Amid the difficulties, confusion, and disorganization of life, the easiest thing to do is to shrug many things aside. But should we part with something that has become a part of millions of people's lives?

This spring revived in a natural way the May Day rallies that had almost become history. This is only natural: People have something to say about the status of state affairs. Judging by the speeches at the May Day rallies, they are worried about the gulf between the democratization of society and its lamentable economic condition—a gulf that has reached extremes. Ideals have been eroded, discipline and order have declined, morality is not held in high esteem. A process of sharp polarization is taking place in society, where forces of an antisocialist orientation are expressing themselves increasingly forcefully. Opposite poles can, as everyone knows, generate an electrical charge. Where will its force be directed—toward destruction, or creation...? That is the key question. A tense situation, as reflected in the lives of ordinary working people, leads to anxiety about tomorrow: What will the turn toward a market economy mean to the working man, who will protect him and how? This year's May Day rallies urged the working people to solidarity: Only in the unity of sober-minded, constructive forces can we stand firm and save perestroyka.

The most diverse opinions on this score were expressed at the May Day rallies, and they were all heard with attention and created a certain mood.

True, the holiday also highlighted the ugly sides of our life today. You only had to walk around the center of the capital to meet, for instance, a student with a black anarchist flag or a group of young men in the uniform of junior officers in the czarist army calling for... the revival of the monarchy. Nor did we get by without provocative acts of hooliganism. The editorial office is receiving a great many telephone calls, and readers ask: What actually happened at the demonstration in Moscow?

The rally in Red Square, whose participants came out in favor of the unification of perestroyka forces and social guarantees for working people, was held by the trade unions. The demonstration that followed was organized by the Moscow Voters' Association together with the new Moscow City Soviet. At its first session the "city parliament" debated this question keenly and presumably clarified its position. This is hardly what the deputies wanted, but at the end of the demonstration columns marched through the square with insulting, provocative slogans. Calls were heard to destroy anything and everything "to the foundations," immediately to introduce a free market, to proclaim total permissiveness in society, and to disband the organs of law and order. There was a direct confrontation with constitutional power.

Insults and hooliganism have never been arguments. All they can do is to indicate a lack of elementary political, and indeed human, cultivation. But in this case it is appropriate to talk about a deliberate attack on democracy: After all, the "leftists" went on the rampage not just anywhere, but in Red Square, in full view of all the world. They shouted abuse at perestroyka not just anytime, but on May Day—supposedly in the name of the working people and all the people. Yet none of these loudmouths had asked the people whether they consent to yet more social upheavals, which there have already been plenty of in our history and for which many millions of people have had to pay. So in whose name did these newly fledged overturners present their ultimatum? The rally politicians declared their claims and ambitions with the full force of trained orators' voices and with the loudspeakers on full volume.... But the

political situation on May Day is hardly likely to have been influenced by these malicious speeches.

At the May Day rallies millions of working people, cutting off the prophecies of the loudmouths, harmoniously and unequivocally expressed their attitude to the present state of social and economic affairs and the future plans for perestroyka. Rather than "historical upheavals" and utopian promises, the people prefer a path that may be less rapid, but is more reliable—the path of political and economic reforms based on the realities of life and on accurate and sober consideration. On concern for reliable social guarantees for working people and poorly off strata of the population. In short, the answers to the difficult questions facing the country should be sought by all of us together.

Dangers of Extreme Radicalism Indicated

PM0405142290 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 4 May 90 Morning Edition p 1

[Aleksandr Protsenko article under the "Political Diary" rubric: "Is It Easy To Be a Democrat?"]

[Text] It seems it is easy to be a democrat nowadays: All you have to do is shout—with great conviction, reveling in your own boldness—"down with" everything that you personally do not like. Down with the mafia, down with the conservatives, down with the administrative system, and what else? Down with a recently adopted decree, resolution, or law, down with the parliamentarians who discuss "goodness knows what." In general, "we will destroy to its very foundations the whole world of coercion (of the state bureaucratic kind, of course)." And what then...?

This wave has swept all the way to the highest officials in the state—the government and the president. The organizers of the informals' May march in Red Square, from the most democratic motives, lifted all censorship on slogans and invited everyone who so wished to join the columns—representatives of all parties and movements, political associations, and simply sympathizers. And what happened? The variety of "colors" of the slogans turned out to be so broad that foreign correspondents could only shrug their shoulders: "Do you call that democracy?" Some people on the extreme left demanded outright the resignation of those same powers thanks to whom they were able absolutely fearlessly and even self-confidently to shout "down with!"

Well, fine, they do not intend to thank anyone for glasnost or for the level of democratization already achieved, but should they not have some kind of general level of cultivation, including political cultivation, since they have formed the desire to engage in politics?

And the most important thing is: Destroying is, of course, not building, and much destruction still lies ahead. But in our excitement at the opportunities that have opened up for general and complete destruction we are apparently already raising our hands against what has been built by way of replacements. It is still only weak and unstable, sometimes not all that noticeable, and, as a rule, very imperfect. But it is new! And only five years ago we would not have dared even to dream about it.

What will we gain, how will the country benefit, if under the influence of those who are least patient, we regularly "sweep away" what has just been built because it is imperfect, and again and again raise up yet another bright future on the vacant site? What will we gain by slandering leaders who are quite consistently (but, as it seems to some radicals, not quickly enough) leading the country along the path of political and economic transformations?

Our perestroyka, as you remember, began with the slogan of acceleration, and only later did it become clear that our former course had to be radically changed. Even then, five years ago, the most perspicacious people were saying this, but was the country ready for it, were the people ready for the irrevocable renunciation of false goals and slogans? Today, thanks to glasnost and the development of democracy, the political prerequisites have been created for this. But economic transformations lag markedly behind, and this was soon reflected in the level of the people's material prosperity. Does this mean that the present political course is wrong? That the country's political leaders are leading it "in the wrong direction?"

True, the opinion does exist that Gorbachev has led the country to total collapse, that instead of democracy permissiveness prevails, and that it is high time someone imposed order with an iron hand. There are quite a few supporters of a "hard line," although their prestige among the people is not yet great. But by demonstrating before the government with slogans that can only be called provocative, today's zealous supporters of the "new acceleration" are objectively acting in the interests of equally zealous conservatives. Because both groups today, as we can see, find the slogan "The worse things are—the better!" to their advantage.

The ultraradicals and ultrademocrats are cheerfully confident that the further impoverishment of the country and the collapse of the economy will force the leadership into equally ultraradical transformations at all costs. The other side is confident of the reverse, that the people, tired of shortages and uncertainty about the future, even if they do not actually demand a "firm hand" and the imposition of the strictest "order," will at least not object if that hand appears without any further requests and puts an end to all today's transformations.

And—alas!—it must once again be observed that the two groups of forces are today objectively converging in their actions.

And another thing. Those who are today shouting "down with!" the loudest of all and demanding immediate changes do not make up a majority of the people or a majority of the country's democratic forces. Nor did they

make up a majority of the demonstrators. But their impatience and extremism merit serious attention. Is not precisely the same position held by those who are today prepared to declare a strike, inevitably a political strike, on any pretext—even if it is a question of an increase in wages? And there are plenty of other examples, too. Today more than ever before what we chiefly need is restraint and political wisdom. In word and deed.

Last month we marked five years of perestroyka. Its results could hardly be summed up by a State Committee for Statistics—the whole country is in motion, and a great deal, unfortunately, is in a state of fragile equilibrium. We should be aware that irresponsible actions could trigger an avalanche of unpredictable consequences. Do we need yet more "historical upheavals" today? Or will democratic forces really be able to unite and consolidate in order to bring the country out of the crisis?

If they are really democratic and really progressive.

Politburo Discusses 28th Congress Preparations

LD0405150390 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1408 GMT 4 May 90

[Text] Moscow, 4 May, (TASS)—At a regular sitting of the Politburo of the CPSU Central Committee, a whole set of questions connected with preparations for the 28th CPSU Congress was examined. It was noted that this work is entering a decisive stage. The whole party is joining in it actively. The party organizations attach great significance to the elections of delegates to the congress, are holding them in the absolute majority in single mandate and multimandate constituencies, on an alternative basis. On the average, four to five candidates have been put forward for every delegate's mandate. Over 200 delegates to the congress have been elected already. The Politburo acknowledged that it is necessary for party organizations to more persistently carry out work to elect to the congress delegates from among workers and peasants.

Noting that a broad discussion is under way in the party on the draft Central Committee Platform and the draft CPSU rules, the Politburo stressed that it was important that a wide diversity of views should be considered and generalized, and used in the course of the in-depth finalization of the pre-congress documents. The CPSU Central Committee has established a commission to prepare for the congress, comprising representatives of party organizations. A proportion of the commission members have already begun examining remarks that have come in concerning the published documents. The Central Committee Politburo has set up a number of groups comprising commission members to work on the drafts of the principal congress documents and resolutions, while paying regard to the general party discussion; members and candidate members of the Politburo and Central Committee secretaries have been entrusted with heading these groups. Provision is made for renewing and supplementing the membership of these groups and for creating new ones by involving delegates of the 28th CPSU Congress.

The session also considered questions connected with preparations for a Russian [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] party conference. The Politburo deemed it desirable to recommend that the Russian Bureau of the CPSU Central Committee submit for consideration by the conference the question of the drafts of the CPS Central Committee Platform and party rules for the 28th CPSU Congress and the question of establishing a Russian Communist Party.

No Evidence Found Involving Gorbachev With 'Mafia'

LD0605144390 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1340 GMT 6 May 90

[Text] Moscow, 6 May (TASS)—A report from the USSR Procuracy has been distributed here today. The text follows below:

Recently the USSR people's deputies Telman Gdlyan and Nikolay Ivanov, despite cautions from the procuracy and the warning by the USSR Supreme Soviet, contained in the 18 April 1990 decision, have stepped up their campaign of slander against a number of politicans and statesmen, and in part against the USSR president.

At various meetings and in the mass media they continue to allege, without proof and with clearly provocative aims, the involvement of Mikhail Gorbachev in mercenary abuses and protection of the mafia. To give their fabrications the semblance of plausibility, they refer to the unknown evidence of some people in the mythical "north Caucasus" affair.

Some like-minded people have joined in this dangerous political adventurism. Particularly active among them is Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic People's Deputy Tatyana Koryagina, elected from the same constituency as Gdlyan.

The USSR Procuracy considers it its duty to report that, despite proposals by the procuracy and investigative organs to show the specific sources of the information being disseminated, Gdlyan and Ivanov do not bring them forward but escape with general demagogic arguments, while Koryagina refers to Gdlyan's unsubstantiated assertations.

After a comprehensive and painstaking examination of affairs within the proceedings of the bodies of the procuracy, the Internal Affairs Ministry, and the KGB, the USSR Procuracy states with full responsibility that there are no testimonies or data which would cast a shadow on the USSR president contained in any of them.

Nevertheless, conspiciously ignoring the USSR Supreme Soviet decision and the warning from the procuracy bodies on halting illegal actions, Gdlyan, Ivanov, and Koryagina also, continue to pile up insinuations regarding the head of state with the aim of destabilizing

the situation in the country. By doing this they openly abuse glasnost and their immunity as deputies. The ill-intentioned actions of Gdlyan, Ivanov, and Koryagina are not only incompatible with the ethical norms and status of a people's deputy, but are subject to accountability before the law. The USSR Procuracy considers it necessary to bring this to the attention of the USSR Supreme Soviet and Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic Supreme Soviet. Law Enforcement bodies are taking the measures envisioned by law.

Patriarch Pimen Dies in Moscow 3 May

Gorbachev Sends Condolences

LD0405111490 Moscow TASS in English 1058 GMT 4 May 90

[Text] Moscow May 4 TASS—President Mikhail Gorbachev has expressed condolences over the death of Patriarch Pimen, leader of the Russian Orthodox Church.

In a telegram to the Church's Holy Synod, he said: "It is with profound sorrow that I learnt of the passing away of Patriarch Pimen of Moscow and all Russia. His humanist activities, aiming to affirm the ideals of good, justice, mercy and peace, won high praise in broad public circles in this country and abroad.

"I convey my sincere condolences to the Holy Synod and all believers of the Russian Orthodox Church."

Lukyanov Expresses Sorrow

LD0405082990 Moscow TASS in English 0715 GMT 4 May 90

[Text] Moscow May 4 TASS—Sincere condolences to the Holy Synod and all believers of the Russian Orthodox Church were expressed by the USSR Supreme Soviet in connection with the death of Patriarch Pimen of Moscow and all Russia.

The telegram, signed by parliament chairman Anatoliy Lukyanov, notes the late patriarch's outstanding services to his homeland and his universally recognised peacemaking charitable activity.

Council of Ministers Note

LD0405111890 Moscow TASS in English 1109 GMT 4 May 90

[Text] Moscow May 4 TASS—The USSR Council of Ministers has expressed profound condolences to the Holy Synod, the Russian Orthodox Church and all believers over the death of Patriarch Pimen of Moscow and All Russia.

"The Soviet Government highly values the contribution made by Patriarch Pimen to the moral renewal of society, enhancement of the sense of responsibility for the development of spiritual culture and the peacemaking activity of the Russian Orthodox Church," says Nikolay Ryzhkov's message.

Gorbachev Awards Order of Peoples' Friendship

LD0405205190 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1300 GMT 4 May 90

[Text] By decree of Comrade Gorbachev, USSR President, Dmitriy Aleksandrovich Blyum-Lyubovich, a teacher at the musical college under the Tchaikovksiy Moscow State Conservatoire, has been awarded the Order of Peoples' Friendship for his great services in training highly skilled specialists and for his fruitful pedagogical activity.

Poll Reveals Dissatisfaction With Reform

LD0405201990 Moscow TASS in English 1953 GMT 4 May 90

[Text] Moscow May 4 TASS—Thirty-four per cent of Soviet residents believe recent reforms did little to improve their lives and it is too early to talk about changes, according to results of a public opinion poll conducted by the IZVESTIYA newspaper. The poll involved 983 residents across the Soviet Union.

Thirty per cent of respondents said reforms bore little fruit because they were indecisive. Twenty-one per cent blamed all problems on perestroika. Further changes will only worsen the situation in the country they said.

The pessimism is largely prompted by the dire economic situation, IZVESTIYA said. Only eight per cent said the changes led to a democratic and economic renewal of society. Three per cent said reforms destroyed socialist gains achieved in the past 70 years.

"They are right to a point. Many structures of barracks-like socialism, we have learned to live with and consider an inalienable part of our way of life, are know being blown apart," the newspaper said.

'Top Priority' Discusses Party Structure

LD0505155790 Moscow in English to North America 2200 GMT 4 May 90

["Top Priority" program introduced by Sergey Goryachev, with political analysts Sergey Plekhanov and Andrey Kortunov]

[Text] [Goryachev] How do you do, ladies and gentlemen, welcome to "Top Priority." I am Sergey Goryachev. As the 28th Congress of the Soviet Communist Party, due to open on 2 July draws nearer, the discussion is widening on the future of the Communist Party that has been ruling this country for 73 years. The discussion is going on at a time when the official party structures are losing their positions, and when the rank-and-file party members are facing a very hard choice. This choice has

been offered not only by a variety of new parties that have appeared here, but also by several opposed trends within the party.

Do you think that those observers who believe that the outcome of the rivalry between these trends will determine the future of not only the Communist Party but of the whole society are right? That is what this program is all about, and my guests are Sergey Plekhanov to my left, Andrey Kortunov to my right, and by saying so I do not necessarily imply that you, Sergey, are a left—that you are a left-winger—and you are a right-winger.

[Plekhanov] Depending on where you sit.

[Goryachev] OK, all right. This is a roundtable, after all. But first of all let us make it clear what trends we are discussing, what trends we are talking about. Now one division singles out the right-wing as conservatives, the moderate reformers, and the left-wing radicals in the party. Another division, which I think is more accurate, is based on the main platforms that have been published in the Soviet press, and that is the platform by the Central Committee, the Democratic Platform, and the Marxist Platform. Now, to begin with, I would like to ask you a couple of personal questions. Of course, if you do not feel comfortable about that you may not answer, but both of you are members of the Communist Party, is that correct?

[Plekhanov] Yes.

[Kortunov] Yes.

[Goryachev] All right. Andrey Kortunov, what trend do you support? And I think that in his discussion it will become more clear what is what.

[Kortunov] Well, personally I think the Democratic Platform is the most promising document.

[Goryachev] Why? Tell us why then.

[Kortunov] Well, because it really gives us some perspective, and I think that it is more appealing for the educated part of the population, and of course I think that all three options of the platform do have a right to exist, because I can imagine that even the, you know, the most conservative one will have some attractions for certain strata of the society. Therefore much—actually, you know, we already have three parties within one party.

[Goryachev] OK, Sergey does not agree on this stand, especially when you say that this Democratic Platform is for the educated part of the population. What is your position as a Communist Party member?

[Plekhanov] I think among the party members, appeal for the Democratic Platform is not limited to the intelligentsia.

[Goryachev] Yes.

[Plekhanov] You see, the Democratic Platform is not actually a full-fledged platform. It concentrates on procedural and organizational issues. It does not tackle a whole range of issues which the country is faced with. That's why, I think, there is actually very little in conflict between the two platforms.

[Goryachev] All right. Probably we should first single out the characteristic features of this platform. I think that the Democratic Platform speaks about the party becoming a parliamentary type of party.

[Plekhanov] Yes.

[Goryachev] Also that organized groups are permitted within the party and it speaks a lot about the crisis of the Communist ideology, is that correct?

[Plekhanov] Yes.

[Goryachev] OK.

[Plekhanov] And those are the features which make it, put it into conflict with, the Central Committee of the Communist Party. I think that the conflict can bring positive results. It's a healthy conflict and I don't agree with those people who think that belonging to the radical platform should be grounds for expelling people from the party. Unfortunately, this has happened in a number of places. As far as the Central Committee platform is concerned, I think for the official party ideology it presents a huge step forward, because it incorporates into the official party doctrine all the idas which now form the basis of perestroyka, of economic and political reform. I remember how the Western media treated the appearance of the Central Committee platform. They were absolutely perplexed by things like individual property, ownership of the means of production, abandoning the monopoly of the party on power, a number of other things concerning the democratic institutions, and development of democratic institutions. If you compare the official ideology embodied in this platform with what was considered official only a year before you'd see a quantum jump.

[Goryachev] OK, you said that it's a step forward, but for Andrey it is not enough.

[Kortunov] Well, I think the choice is evident. Either the Communsit Party turns out to be just another parliamentary party, or it will still pretend to be something more than a parliamentary party.

[Plekhanov] Well, I think if we proceed from reality we'll have to face the fact that the party has a lot of power in this country. It is the ruling party, and no matter how many other parties will be organized in the next few months or few years I can't foresee any serious rival to the Communist Party. So, if one is a realist, one has to deal with the fact that this is the governing party. And one has to, if one believes in democratization, one has to work within that party and to help move it forward toward the democratic goals which it set for itself.

[Kortunov] Oh, but I think that just a year ago everything you said could be applied to East European countries.

[Plekhanov] No, I think there is a deep difference between the situation in this country and in Eastern Europe, and the difference is that here the revolution took place on its own, just like in China. That's why you can never expect a whirlwind of a change that took place in Eastern European countries—in Yugoslavia, too; by the same token the Yugoslav Communist Party has a much firmer grip on power and much deeper roots in society, precisely because that party won its leadership position in society by itself without any foreign interference.

[Goryachev] Yes, but not [words indistinct].

[Kortunov] Well, but on the other hand I would say that the crisis is deeper here, the standards of living are lower here, and atrocities of the regime are much graver here than in Eastern Europe.

[Plekhanov] Well, but, consider—talking about atrocities, if you count the number of communists, good communists who were killed by Stalin and his henchmen, you will have to recognize that (?means) communists themselves have been the brunt of those repressions, and at least those of them who fought for different ideas than Stalin represented, they are entitled to a hearing and the chance to move the country forward.

[Kortunov] Yes, but, you know, it proves that the communists themselves didn't manage to create a structure that would, you know, have any safeguards against all these things.

[Plekhanov] It is the Communist Party, as the leading party, as the governing party, that has led us from Brezhnev to this democratic [words indistinct].

[Kortunov] Yes, because all the opposition that had any chances to emerge outside the party was simply eliminated by the party itself. It's evident: Nobody could start this process.

[Plekhanov] Ah, but that's a different question. That's a different question. We are talking about the results of the Communist Party being in power for 73 years, and if you say what are the results, you cannot wipe out the last five years, which represent perhaps the most radical revolution in those 70 years.

[Goryachev] All right. Sergey, let me ask you a question. Was it the Communist Party which led the Soviet society to perestroyka? I think it was a bunch of people on top who realized that something was going wrong and that something should be done about it.

[Plekhanov] Look, you can't say it seriously. What do you mean, a few people at the top leading the Soviet Union? Don't you know how the Soviet Union is organized, how it's structured, how the power structure works?

[Goryachev] Yes, I know. That's why I say it.

[Plekhanov] Don't you know how decisions are made, how they are implemented? In the first place that small group of reformers that you're talking about, they came to their power positions from within the party. They're classic cases of party leaders working their way up from the bottom. There is nothing in the career of Gorbachev that would paint him as somebody who had been, you know, hiding all those ideas for decades and suddenly trying to implement them when he became the leader of the Soviet Union. Any serious scholar or expert on the Soviet Union that exists in the West recognizes that perestroyka was a natural process of the evolution of the Soviet regime and of the Communist Party. So the new bunch of radicals that appeared on the scene now don't want to recognize this for one reason or another. I think they're talking, you know, in some kind of historical vacuum because we've (?phoned)—the evolution that has taken place had to be deep-rooted. It had to have roots in the party and in the governing structure, in the legitimate needs of the state.

[Goryachev] All right.

[Plekhanov] And that means that there was something in that power structure which gave birth to perestroyka.

[Goryachev] Which permitted perestroyka.

[Plekhanov] Not only permitted, but made it necessary.

[Goryachev] All right, so if there was an election today and you were to vote for either trend, you would vote for the platform outlined by the Central Committee, am I right?

[Plekhanov] I don't know. I'm not supposed to vote for the platforms, and actually I don't think in terms of platforms.

[Goryachev] OK. What about you Andrey, what would you support?

[Kortunov] Well, you know, first of all I think that the current election process is too highly centralized and not democratic. And it proves once again that the party is lagging behind the society in its...[changes thought]...Rather than leading the society it's lagging behind it. Second, I think that, you know, it's, again it's my personal opinion but...

[Goryachev interrupting] Sure.

[Kortunov] I think that people simply will not care much about, about the party because there are no new power structures emerging in the society, and (?by) far more important than the party itself, and I don't think that people are very much interested even in the congress of the Communist Party.

[Goryachev] But this, this congress is going to be decisive, I think, for the life of the Soviet Union too.

[Kortunov] Of course.

[Goryachev] Because the Communist Party is the ruling party and has deep roots. I agree with Sergey on that point. It has deep roots in this society and whatever happens, even the Communist Party will have a very strong (?margin) [words indistinct] on the whole society.

[Kortunov] (?Well, that's so), but let us, you know, put it straight.

[Goryachev] OK.

[Kortunov] There has never been such a thing as a Communist Party in the Soviet Union. It has never been a party. No, it was a certain, you know, consensus-seeking mechanism, highly centralized, not democratic but still consensus-seeking mechanism which was a supplement for legal society. And now we have, you know, civil society emerging, and therefore I think that the importance of the decisions made within the party leadership will erode. It's evident that now not the Politburo but rather the Presidential Council is responsible for major decisions.

[Goryachev] Yeah, yeah, I understand your point, but can you answer this: Why don't those party members who do not agree with the general line, with the line of the Central Committee which is the governing body of the party, why don't they quit their party membership right now?

[kortunov] Well, some of them do.

[Goryachev] Very few of them, I (?suppose).

[Plekhanov] Yeah, because I think most of them realize that the fight within the party is far from over and they don't want to abandon the party to the right wing, to the nationalists, to the conservatives, to the militarists who may use the party in order to legitimize the [words indistinct]. That is,the very radical transformation of the Communist Party is quite strong.

[Goryachev] The irony is that no one says he is against perestroyka, everyone is for this.

[Plekhanov] Right.

[Goryachev] People see different ways of achieving the goals of perestroyka and so do the Communists. They have different views on that.

[Plekhanov] Well, but I mean it doesn't take a lot of common sense to see a difference between an old line apparatchik, who everybody knows what he stands for and to see through his pretence that he is for perestroyka, and compare him with the people who are really fighting for these progressive ideas. So, I think it's not so difficult, especially when we are talking about people known to rank and file members. When it's clear...[changes thought]...Who is who is quite obvious to those people. So, if the rank and file has a chance to vote democratically then I think the result will be in support of reform.

[Goryachev] Speaking about the different trends within the Communist Party, I think we should also talk about the split which has taken place already along the national, nationalistic line. Now, look at the Lithuanian Communist Party: It was the first, I believe, to split from the Soviet Communist Party. Is this a dangerous thing or is it positive?

[Kortunov] Well, it can be dangerous for the existing structure.

[Goryachev] This is what the leadership says. Do you agree with that?

[Kortunov] Well, I mean, it is, it can be dangerous for the existing structure of the party itself, but I think in a way, first of all, it's inevitable if the local party leadership wants, you know, to preserve at least some portion of political influence in the republics. They are bound to demand independence.

[Goryachev] But, will it make the Communist Parties, the republican Communist Parties, weaker or stronger. I think they could become even stronger if they enjoy this will of the people.

[Plekhanov] Well, those, the Lithuanians...

[Goryachev, interrupting] ...if they meet the sentiments of the people.

[Plekhanov] If you look at the Lithuanians, it shows that this is the way to oblivion because the party there has adopted this independence line and it was swallowed by the Popular Front, by the Sajudis movement. And the general secretary, who expected to become the president of Lithuania, was shunted aside. So, Lithuania is a good case in point. It shows that if Communists become nationalists, they don't hold their power for long because, you know, people would opt for the real thing. And the real thing are the nationalists. I mean, in the nationalist camp. So, you have to, you have to start fighting against nationalism at an earlier stage.

[Goryachev] I think we should wait for the congress and we'll see what happens then, and of course we will discuss the developments in our future programs, but I think that just to wind up this program, that whatever the outcome of the discussion is or whatever the outcome of the congress is, I think that it's clear that the society will never more agree to one leading party. And that it is the party, the Communist Party, or another party, that will have to adapt itself to the needs of the society.

[Plekhanov] At the same time, you know, there will be governing parties if there is even a multi-party system. The party that will get the majority of votes will be the majority—the governing party, while it has the majority. So, the position of leadership will be occupied by someone.

[Goryachev] By someone.

[Plekhanov] But it's not something that it is given. It's something that must be renewed at the polls.

[Goryachev] Yes. And that's it, "Top Priority" for today. My guests were Sergey Plekhanov, Andrey Kortunov, our two political analysts. Hosting the programme was Sergey Goryachev. Until next week, goodbye.

Ryzhkov, Ligachev Address Oil Conference

PM2504135090 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 24 Apr 90 Second Edition pp 1-2

[Unattributed report: "Monitoring the Oil and Gas Workers' Problems"]

[Text] At a conference held 23 April by USSR Council of Ministers Chairman N.I. Ryzhkov by way of monitoring, reports were heard from leaders of ministries and departments on the fulfillment of instructions given after the meeting with the country's oil and gas workers. As is well known, this meeting took place at the USSR Council of Ministers at the end of March, when there was a principled discussion of the country's oil and gas extraction situation, the increased complexity of the economic situation of the majority of enterprises, and the growing social difficulties, especially in the oil and gas extracting regions of Western Siberia.

The conference participants included Ye.K. Ligachev, Yu.D. Maslyukov, A.V. Vlasov, USSR Council of Ministers Deputy Chairmen L.A. Voronin, P.I. Mostovoy, and I.S. Silayev, and ministers, leaders of central economic departments, and Tyumen Oblast representatives.

How are the difficult questions raised at the head of government's meeting with oil and gas workers being resolved? In his report L.I. Filimonov, USSR minister of the petroleum and gas industry minister, noted that the 28 March report "On Measures for Improving the Work of the Petroleum Industry in 1990" is well known in the collectives of oil and gas extracting enterprises. Over the month, concrete work has been and is being done toward fulfilling the instructions, and this can be seen on the ground. However, by no means everything has been done that could have been done by now. The oil workers of Tyumen Oblast—the country's main fuel center—have been experiencing particularly great difficulties.

The main attention at the conference was concentrated precisely on this aspect of the question. What is being done too slowly? Above all, material and technical provision for meeting the state order for oil and gas. The attention of the USSR Gosplan [State Planning Committee] and USSR Gossnab [State Committee for Material and Technical Supply] was drawn to the fact that they have still not resolved the problems of providing oil and gas workers with pipes and oilfield equipment. With all the difficulties that exist in the country, a solution must be found, since a key sector of the national economy is at issue. Instructions were given to prepare proposals on wholesale prices for oil and gas.

The USSR Council of Ministers chairman was strongly critical of slackness in improving the everyday social conditions of oil and gas workers. It was noted that the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] Council of Ministers and the USSR Ministry of Trade should show more urgency and initiative in providing the working people of Tyumen and Tomsk Oblasts with consumer goods, including foodstuffs. However, the attention of ministries and local organizations was drawn to the increase in food products owing to the growth of local production.

In this huge extraction center, it is also necessary to act more decisively in questions of housing construction also, since in Tyumen Oblast tens of thousands of people are housed in sledge-mounted huts and other temporary structures. The whole country needs oil and gas, and this means that the union republics must fulfill their obligations in the sphere of house building. Moscow, Leningrad, the Ukraine, Belorussia, Uzbekistan, and other union republics were instructed to continue the construction of the social and cultural complex in Tyumen Oblast during the 13th Five-Year Plan.

A report that the question of introducing additional flights and railway routes in the summer from the cities and settlements of the West Siberian oil and gas complex to the south of the country has not been settled in the past month conveyed a reproach to the Ministries of Railways and Civil Aviation, and at the same time to the Ministry of the Petroleum and Gas Industry. Coordination is still in progress.

In his speech Ye.K. Ligachev drew attention to the fact that the strengthening of the union republics' sovereignty must not serve as an obstacle to the concentration of forces and resources on the resolution of statewide problems, especially in regions of the exploitation of natural resources that are extremely necessary to the country as a whole and to each republic.

At the conference the leaders of the USSR Council of Ministers Bureau for the Fuel and Energy Complex were criticized for weak monitoring and insufficient organization of the fulfillment of the instructions which had been given.

N.I. Ryzhkov emphasized in conclusion that monitoring of the implementation of everything outlined at the meeting with the oil and gas workers will continue. We must create the necessary conditions for confident work by the sector in the current year. It would be a good idea, he suggested, to form a government commission for the oil industry, including the interests of the West Siberian oil and gas complex. The desirability of determining the prospects for the development of the fuel and energy complex in Western Siberia was expressed.

Democratic Platform Members Oppose Party Split

LD2804140390 Moscow World Service in English 1100 GMT 28 Apr 90

[Text] Most Communists sharing the views of the left-wing radicals belonging to the Democratic Platform in the Communist Party of the Soviet Union are against a split in the party, said Vyacheslav Shostakovskiy, member of the Democratic Platform's Coordinating Council. The number of their supporters, he said, has already reached several thousand people. They include not only grass-roots Communists but also sympathizers in the Communist Party of the Soviet Union Central Committee. When asked whether the supporters of radical changes intend to form a party of their own eventually, Shostakovskiy said that this talk is based largely on statements made by some individuals. The destiny of the Democratic Platform in the Communist Party of the Soviet Union can be decided only by the national conference to be held in the second half of May, he said.

Trade Union Congress Adopts Program

LD2704215490 Moscow TASS in English 2017 GMT 27 Apr 90

[By TASS correspondent Lilia Novitskaya and Yafim Shvartsman]

[Text] Odessa April 27 TASS—The special congress of a new independent trade union amalgamation of Soviet cooperative societies, which ended in Odessa, USSR's southwest, today, adopted a programme for social maitenance of cooperative members.

The three-day congress was attended by representatives from Moscow, Leningrad, Kiev and other cities of the Russian Federation, the Ukraine, Central Asia and Kazakhstan.

According to Amalgamation Chairman Alekcandr Tyurin, the programme provides for the introduction of the most fair personified system of social insurance for each trade unionist.

The system will enable him to control the size of accumulations which will be a hefty addition to his pension.

Tyurin added that it is also important that any trade unionist may freely dispose of his accumulations and receive considerable grants for personal and public needs from the central fund.

This system was successfully tested by the independent amalgamated trade unions of cooperative societies in Aktyubinsk Region, Western Kazakhstan.

According to leader of the Aktubinsk Organisation Artur Bulakov, the trade union has something to defend in the government after the system was adopted by the all-union congress in Odessa.

There were heated discussions at the congress concerning cooperative members' legal protection.

"There is real discrimination against our trade unions," believes Aleksandr Loginov, a representative from Yakutia, eastern siberia. "We are ignored, especially by local government bodies which often interprete state laws in their favour. We need a skilled legal service."

Most delegates favoured the unification of independent unions on the principles of a federation. They also confirmed their choice organisationally, registering their personal membership in the amalgamation.

The new independent Union of Soviet Cooperative Societies intends to establish broad contacts with counterparts abroad.

AUCCTU Chief Urges Action, Reform

904F0136A Moscow TRUD in Russian 18 Apr 90 p 2

[Report by AUCCTU Chairman G.I. Yanayev at first meeting of Eighth AUCCTU Plenum: "On the Convocation of the 19th Congress of USSR Trade Unions"]

[Text] Comrades! The 18th Congress of USSR Trade Unions was held in February 1987. Pursuant to the statute the next, 19th, Congress should be held five years later, in early 1992. However, changes currently under way in all spheres of our life demand that it be brought forward.

Actually, a discussion on the trade unions, which we could with full justification call a precongress discussion, has already begun. The reports-and-elections campaign in the primary organizations and regions, the Constituent Russian Congress of Trade Unions which finished recently, the extraordinary congresses of trade unions of Estonia, of the trade unions of fishermen and miners, and the trade unions of cooperative employees in union republics have become conspicuous landmarks on this path. This discussion is under way against the background of vigorous reconsideration of the role and place of traditional structures and institutions: the party, soviets, and public organizations. Our society rejects the old in a quite categorical manner. The trade unions are no exception in this matter.

At the 18th Congress of Trade Unions, and at the subsequent plenums of the AUCCTU [All-Union Central Council of Trade Unions], the concepts of perestroyka have been given resolute support; a substantial shift has emerged in the direction of reinforcing the protective function of the trade unions, relieving them of the responsibilities that are not properly theirs, and acquiring independence, primarily at the level of primary organizations. The trade union deputies in the country's parliament have given vigorous support to our new, independent position. Principled measures in defense of the workers undertaken by the AUCCTU in a number of acute socioeconomic situations have gained the support of labor collectives.

However, an objective look at ourselves prompts us to acknowledge that for many decades the trade unions

were built into the system of party, state, and economic organs. Everything was entrusted to the trade unions, from socialist competition to the distribution of goods in short supply. This distracted us from the main pursuit—principled defense of the rights and interests of the working man. As a result, the trade unions are now experiencing a serious crisis of confidence on the part of the workers.

This is exactly why our entire strategy, the theory of the trade union movement itself, and many aspects of the organizational structure—in short, the role and place of trade unions in a changing society—should be resolutely reconsidered. Preparing and moving up the 19th congress as much as possible will give us such an opportunity, which we have a duty to fully take advantage of.

The need for a sharp turnaround in the operation of the trade unions and the greatest possible reinforcement of their protective functions is also due to the new conditions of the economic and sociopolitical situation. The laws on ownership, land, leasing, and the foundations of local self-government change the sphere of labor relations of which the trade unions are the main component virtually in its entirety. New draft laws on a broad array of economic issues are being completed—on the development of market relations, restructuring of finance and credit policy, price reform, and anti-monopoly measures.

Changes of this magnitude require that new priorities be set, which the congress of the country's trade unions is called upon to develop and reflect in its program documents. The current trade union statute is not in line with the actual situation, and is in need of a profound revision.

Processes in the sphere of state and legal relations also prompt us to move up the trade union congress: the completion of the formation of the organs of people's power from the local level to the national parliament, the introduction of the presidential form of government, and the transformation of the state from a unitary to a full-fledged federative one.

The sovereignty of the union republics is being reinforced; the status of autonomous and other national-territorial entities is being enhanced. All of this calls for changes in the principles of organizational structure of the trade union organs, their interaction and cooperation.

A multiparty system which has become reality, numerous public entities operating in the sphere of competence of the trade unions, and attempts to create alternative trade union associations raise as never before the issue of ensuring the organizational unity of the trade union movement of our country. The entire set of these and many other problems, the solving of which cannot be postponed, has prompted the AUCCTU Presidium to raise the issue of moving up the 19th Congress of USSR Trade Unions.

First of all, concerning the time and procedures for convening the congress, preparing, and holding it. It is proposed on behalf of the AUCCTU Presidium to convene the 19th Congress of USSR Trade Unions on 23 October 1990 in the Kremlin Palace of Congresses with the following agenda:

1. Report by the AUCCTU on its work in the period after the 18th Congress of USSR Trade Unions and the tasks of radical renewal in the trade union movement of our country.

2. Report by the Central Auditing Commission of the USSR Trade Unions.

3. Adoption of the program documents of the congress.

4. Organizational issues.

To be sure, the agenda proposed does not mean that other issues may not arise at the congress. We should facilitate the holding of the congress in a democratic and creative atmosphere.

On the rate of representation and procedures for the election of delegates to the 19th congress. Almost 5,000 delegates participated in the proceedings of the 18th Congress of Trade Unions. This was a representative congress. Let us hold consultations concerning this; it may be worthwhile to reduce the number of delegates to 2,500. This will allow us to make the congress more businesslike and work-oriented. Taking into account the proceedings of the sections, most delegates will have an opportunity to speak and take part in discussing the documents of the congress. Given this number of delegates, it will become possible to use the electronic voting system which will be installed in the pit of the Kremlin Palace of Congresses. This would mean saving time. If the plenum supports this approach, representation at the 19th congress could be set as follows: one delegate for every 60,000 trade union members.

Delegates to the 18th Congress of USSR Trade Unions were elected at the congresses of trade unions, congresses of union republics trade unions, and oblast (kray) interunion conferences of the Russian Federation, the Ukraine, Belorussia, Uzbekistan, and Kazakhstan. The nomination and discussion of the candidacies occurred directly at the congresses and interunion conferences.

In the present situation—this is the thrust of numerous proposals from local echelons—elections of delegates to the 19th congress should be held on a more democratic basis that ensures extensive glasnost, direct participation by the members of the trade unions in nominating and discussing candidate delegates, and the principle of competitiveness in the course of their elections.

In our opinion, to this end it is necessary first of all to give all primary trade union organizations the right to nominate their candidate delegates. Small organizations could nominate candidates at the meeting or conferences of a group of organizations.

There are several proposals on how to organize the election of delegates from among the candidates nominated by the primary organizations. They are outlined in the draft document on procedures for electing candidates to the 19th Congress of USSR Trade Unions which has been handed out to you.

Among other things, it is proposed to hold the elections of delegates from branch trade unions in union republics. In this case, the trade unions of all union republics and all branch trade unions will be represented at the congress mainly in proportion to the number of workers belonging to them.

Version two. To hold elections in production and production-territorial single-seat districts formed depending on the number of trade union members and in keeping with the rate of representation. This proposal has an attractive aspect: direct participation by the trade union members in electing delegates to the congress of trade unions of our country. However, it has disadvantages. It will become necessary for many small branch unions to form electoral districts embracing several oblasts and krays which in many cases are not connected with each other. This will require considerable time and funding. Besides, the current situation in interethnic relations hampers the creation of production districts consisting of the trade union organizations of several autonomous or union republics in a number of cases.

The third version. To hold the elections of delegates at the congresses of branch trade unions of our country, congresses of trade unions of union republics, and oblast (kray) interunion conferences of the Russian Federation, the Ukraine, Belorussia, Uzbekistan, and Kazakhstan.

This procedure is simpler, has proven itself in practice, but is less democratic.

It is important to stress that candidate delegates should be nominated by the primary trade union organizations and elected with their opinion taken into account as much as possible in the course of implementing any of the three versions.

Comrades, let us consult today at the plenum and with the primary organizations concerning which of the versions presented or other procedures for electing delegates will be the most acceptable at our trade union movement's current stage of development.

The following issue has also arisen—is it feasible to hold once again a full-scale reports-and-elections campaign, as the Statute of USSR Trade Unions requires. As you know, the reports and elections of the organizations and organs whose terms of office had expired by that time were completed in January of this year.

Many trade union councils and committees are proposing to hold reports-and-elections meetings in trade union organizations with up to 150 trade union members. It is also proposed to hold republic reports-and-elections conferences of branch trade unions, and congresses of branch trade unions and union republics. Reports by trade union committees and councils could be heard at the remaining levels, and delegates to the respective conferences and congresses could be elected.

A proposal to extend the powers of the delegates who were elected to the city, rayon, oblast, and kray interunion conferences held in December and January also merits attention. This could be done by expanded plenums of trade union organs with the consent of primary trade union organizations.

Trade union councils and committees have the right to resolve on their own the issues of timing and forms of organization of all such work. However, taking the date of holding the 19th Congress of USSR Trade Unions into account, it should be completed before 5 October or 10 October of this year. Naturally by this time it will be necessary to form the ranks of delegates to the all-union congress.

Voices have been heard to the effect that it is difficult to hold a reports-and-elections campaign within a period that short.

The AUCCTU Presidium is aware of this. However, it has come to a unanimous opinion that the trade union congress cannot be postponed until a later date. Postponing the congress means postponing the most acute problems of the development of our trade union movement, which only the supreme organ of USSR trade unions is empowered to solve.

The processes of renewal have already begun. The congresses of the fishermen and miners trade unions proceeded in the spirit of determination. The Federation of RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] Independent Trade Unions and the Central Council of Trade Unions of Estonia were formed on a foundation different in principle. The congresses of trade unions of other Baltic republics and Georgia will be held on a new platform. The task of the AUCCTU in its capacity as the trade union center of the USSR is to head these processes and to work out and adopt a program of radical renewal in the trade union movement of the country. These are the tasks of the trade union congress, and holding it as soon as possible has become an obvious, acute necessity.

Comrades!

The new situation in the trade union movement is marked primarily by the increasing role of the primary trade union organization, the independence of branch trade unions, and reinforcement of the sovereignty of trade union centers of union republics. In conjunction with the above, the issue of program documents to be adopted at the 19th Congress of Trade Unions arises anew.

You know well that previously the Statute of USSR Trade Unions was discussed at every congress and a resolution on the tasks of the trade union movement was

adopted. The operation of all the rather diverse structures of our trade unions was regulated by the same statute.

An issue arises under the new circumstances. Does the trade union movement of the country need a single statute? In the opinion of the AUCCTU Presidium, statutes will primarily be needed for the branch trade unions. The congresses of trade unions of union republics could adopt their program documents.

Proceeding from the above, the AUCCTU Presidium submits for your consideration a proposal not to adopt a Statute of USSR Trade Unions, and instead adopt a Declaration on Setting Up the Soviet Trade Union Confederation and the Main Organizational Principles and Procedures for the Operation of the Soviet Trade Union Confederation.

It appears that the draft declaration and the main principles will become an AUCCTU platform for the 19th Congress of Trade Unions. An extensive discussion of them in the primary trade union organizations, the conferences, and congresses will help us verify more precisely the course and character of the renewal processes our trade union movement will have to go through.

The draft declaration and main principles have been handed out to you. We count on discussing them profoundly and comprehensively. Allow me to state some considerations on the provisions of these documents important in principle in anticipation of the discussion.

First of all, about the declaration in which we propose to set forth the main approaches to the structure of our trade union movement. It is becoming increasingly obvious that the principle of democratic centralism as it was interpreted previously, the command methods, and the entire hierarchical trade union structure are no longer in line with changing production and social relations.

A study of the experience of trade unions in the world and the tendencies that have recently manifested themselves in our country suggests that the principle of federalism would be the most rational and possible form of organization, which presupposes the voluntary unification of primary trade union organizations into both professional and regional unions and councils.

Among other things, the sovereignty of the trade union associations of union republics is an integral part of the sovereignty of the latter. This was graphically shown by the formation of the Federation of Independent Trade Unions of Russia. The federative principles are also beginning to be expressed in the structure of the branch trade unions within which professional associations, guilds, and sections appear.

The following question naturally arises under the circumstances: "What is the unified trade union movement of our country to be like? On what principles should the USSR trade union center be created and operate?"

Proceeding from the fact that the trend to form trade union structures on a federative basis is increasingly apparent in the union republics and branches, the creation of the Soviet Trade Union Confederation would be the most acceptable proposal, as we see it.

Perhaps it is necessary to explain this notion as it applies in international legal practice. A confederation is a permanent union of organizations which maintain their independent existence and unite with a view to coordinating their activities on most significant issues. In simpler terms, a confederation is an association of federations.

Without anticipating the decisions of the congress which is to determine the nature and content of activities of the trade union center of our country, we should mention in brief the possible aspects of the confederation.

—Primarily, this would be the coordination of the work of the branch trade unions and the trade union centers of the union republics with a view to ensuring the unity of our actions in defense of the workers' interests.

—This would be participation in the creation of law at the level of the parliament of our country and relations with the union government and central economic organs of the country.

—On the initiative of its member organizations, the trade union center will be called upon to head interbranch, interrepublic programs involving acute social problems. At present, these are Chernobyl, Armenia, the Aral Sea, national employment programs, fighting inflation, and improving work conditions. There will definitely be other major problems in the future.

—The trade union center of the country maintains extensive bilateral relations with the national trade union centers of foreign countries, and represents the common goals of our trade union movement in international trade union, nongovernmental, and intergovernmental organizations.

Regardless of how the united trade union center is going to be named—the AUCCTU, the Council of the Federation, Confederation, or something else—it is clear that its relations with all branch and regional member organizations should proceed from the principles of:

federalism and democracy;

unity of actions and solidarity;

openness to any association which subscribes to our common goals and principles;

respect for the independence of each member organization.

We believe that the draft Declaration on Setting Up the Trade Union Confederation of the Country and the Main Organizational Principles and Procedures for the Operation of the Soviet Trade Union Confederation should be discussed comprehensively in the primary organizations, elected trade union organs of other echelons, congresses of branch trade unions, and trade unions of the union republics so that we are able to do additional work on them before the 19th congress, taking the results of this discussion into account. If they agree with these documents, authorized representatives of the member organizations—branch trade unions, trade union centers of union republics, and other trade union associations—could sign them. This would amount to the constitutional act of voluntary unification in a single confederation of independent, sovereign trade union structures on a qualitatively new organizational and substantive foundation. It is important to stress that the future trade union center should be democratic and efficient. It is important not to turn it into a discussion club incapable of developing and implementing a strong social policy.

Suggestions are coming from the field to the effect that we should not strive to ensure similarity in the structure of all trade union organs. It is also necessary to acknowledge the opportunity for the trade union organizations to form the councils of trade unions and other trade union organs differently (Kalinin-, Stavropol-, Moscow-style, and so on). You know that such experiments are already under way in a number of territories, and they have been effective.

The constituent Russian trade union congress definitively came out in favor of the primary organizations themselves deciding which trade union organs they need and which organs are going to be more helpful to them, the primary organizations. If the plenum agrees with this approach it may be reflected in the draft program documents and submitted to the congress as the fundamental principle of formation of the trade union organs.

Life demands that we form the elected organs of trade unions in a new and more democratic manner. As our practice shows, in the contemporary environment the principle of direct delegation best meets this requirement. By now, over 800 branch committees of the oblast, kray, and republic echelon, 43 trade union councils, and the Council of the Independent RSFSR Trade Unions have been formed on the basis of this approach.

This approach makes it possible to take into account the opinion of trade union members in the course of forming trade union organs at various levels, to enhance the responsibility of those who belong to the elected organs for the segments entrusted to them and, if necessary, to recall comrades from organs and delegate new ones.

Direct delegate appointments provide an opportunity for an organic combination of vertical and horizontal structures of trade unions. Trade union councils formed in keeping with this principle by branch trade union organizations do not place themselves above them, and become organs of coordination and interaction in solving branch and interbranch problems, rather than a command echelon.

It appears feasible to form the All-Union Trade Union Center (Council) based on the principle of direct representation of the member organizations. The members of the council are expected to be delegated at the republic and branch congresses of trade unions.

As far as the rate of representation of the member organizations at the congress is concerned, several variants have been offered to you. Let us establish together which one of them will be the most democratic and fair.

Perhaps the presidium (or another elected organ) of the trade union center should include one person delegated by every member organization. It is expected that the chairman, his deputies, and secretaries of the council will be members of the presidium.

It is necessary to outline in the program documents our interpretation of the place of trade unions in the country's sociopolitical system.

We expect to proclaim in an absolutely definitive manner the statutory independence of trade unions from organs of state and economic management, political and other public organizations.

We should proceed from the fact that protecting the interests of the workers and pursuing a strong social policy is becoming the main thrust of all trade union activities.

This is exactly why the trade unions are embarking on the path of partnership on an equal footing and, if necessary, constructive opposition to the governments of the country and of the republics, ministries and offices, and local executive and economic organs. We should be prepared to carry out independent economic reviews of economic projects and submit alternative programs on socioeconomic and legal issues.

In the environment of a multiparty system and pluralism in public life, the trade unions will act as partners of only those political and economic forces that favor the defense and reinforcement of the social accomplishments of workers unequivocally and vigorously.

The issue of the participation of the trade unions as an independent public force in the struggle for representation in the legislative organs at all levels, from the Supreme Soviet of the country to rayon and city soviets locally, is being placed on the agenda.

It is necessary to be given an opportunity to communicate more extensively and rapidly to the public opinion of our country the trade union point of view on the most acute problems of concern to the workers. This means that it is necessary to have our own independent press, and to ensure that our own radio and TV broadcasts be provided.

The freedom of action of trade unions depends to a great degree on their financial and material potential. This is why the reinforcement of trade union property and material facilities also represents an element of our independence and a guarantee of it.

We should specifically point out the problem of mutual relations between the trade unions and various political forces, primarily the CPSU.

Major shifts which are significant in principle have occurred in the sociopolitical life of our country. The Communist Party, under whose guidance we have worked for many years, has renounced its monopoly on power and opened the way to a multiparty system. For us, this means the need to realize fully that the trade unions are a nonparty organization, that people with various party affiliations may be not only among the membership but also in the leadership which, naturally, should be united in order to accomplish trade- union rather than party tasks.

We receive with satisfaction the words from the CPSU Platform for the 28th Party Congress on the party viewing the trade unions as an independent public organization and supporting their aspiration to act vigorously in the workers' interests, to defend their labor and socioeconomic rights. We are prepared to cooperate with the CPSU and other political organizations of the country on this basis, in the interests of the working people, with a view to building humane, democratic socialism.

The appearance of a number of new organizations in the sphere of social protection is an important peculiarity of the situation in which we have to work. I am not referring to grassroots, informal associations but to quite well-established public organizations.

I believe that the future trade union association of the country should be able to incorporate in its ranks all forces whose position is to defend the rights and legitimate interests of workers within the framework of the socialist option. It should ensure a plurality of opinions, freedom of speech, and the prevention of any discrimination on the basis of political or religious views.

Along with this cornerstone, the unity of action of the trade unions was, is, and will always be the main principle of our trade union movement. We are in favor of a united trade union organization at an enterprise, in favor of united strong branch trade unions and republic trade union centers, in favor of a united trade union center of the country. We are against all attempts to split the workers' movement and to weaken the solidarity of workers.

Therefore, comrades, in the very short period of time remaining until October we have to work very vigorously in order for the 19th Congress of USSR Trade Unions to be held on a new, democratic basis and in keeping with new principles. However, this is not to suggest that we may concentrate our efforts only on the organizational issues of preparing for the congress. It is necessary to use the time remaining to reinforce the trade unions and step up their activities, especially in the field of protective functions.

This is particularly topical at present, when the nature and main features of the political and socioeconomic system within which we will live and work are being determined.

In the most general outline, the thrust of accelerating the economic reform—this is currently being discussed in detail in the Presidential Council and the government of the country—comes down to a transition to a regulated market system. The trade unions should be aware that, along with improving the efficiency of production, reinforcing incentives for labor, enterprise, and initiative, social problems will be exacerbated considerably in our society. World experience indicates that increased inflation, reduced employment, and the loss of a number of social accomplishments are unavoidable, at least at the first stage of our transition to a market economy. All this compels us to be as serious as possible, analyze the emerging situation in a timely manner, offer alternative variants of economic solutions aimed at defending the interests of the working populace, and defend them staunchly.

We are in favor of introducing regulated market relations only on the condition that a system of "social shock absorbers" consisting of legal, economic, and social guarantees be built into the economy.

For example, it is becoming absolutely obvious that the urgency of problems associated with ensuring the complete and efficient employment of the populace keeps increasing with every passing day. It is necessary to specifically point out this problem at our plenum.

Until recently, it was believed that unemployment only exists abroad. Only the first steps in the implementation of the economic reform have been taken as yet; yet more than 3 million people have already been released from the sphere of material production. Many of them have found employment, but we should say bluntly that hundreds of thousands of people have been looking for work and have been unable to find it so far.

The AUCCTU is aware of many instances in which production shops and sections are cut back at enterprises without coordinating with the labor collectives and trade unions. In the process, the management takes no measures to place these people in jobs in the future and shows no interest in what happens to them.

The position of the trade union on the issues of defending the rights and interests of the workers, and their main right—the right to work—should be unbending; no compromise in this matter is possible.

A transition to market relations will definitely exacerbate the problem of unemployment to a critical point. Given our deformed economy, in which hundreds and

thousands of enterprises operate at a loss or are unprofitable, and operate old, entirely worn-out equipment, their bankruptcy is inescapable unless due measures are taken.

The painful consequences of structural shifts in our investment policy which affect the employment of workers in capital-intensive branches come in addition to the above. For example, early this year the future of the jobs of tens of thousands of construction workers in West Siberia, the Baykal-Amur zone, and at many projects of the power industry was in doubt.

The emerging situation suggests that massive unemployment may appear in our country, which will affect the future of millions of Soviet people.

Under the circumstances, only one path is open for the trade unions—to make the struggle for employment the focal point of all our actions in defense of the interests of workers.

We are categorically against the position of a number of representatives of the economic science who propose to entirely repudiate the guaranteed right to work and to consciously maintain unemployment at a certain level as a means of pressuring employees, increasing the intensiveness of their labor and the degree of their exploitation.

The situation emerging in the sphere of employment calls for profound changes and entirely different approaches. In essence, a new policy of the state in this sphere is necessary. The socialist state should be precisely the guarantor of social protection for honest and diligent hard workers.

All of this needs to be reflected in legislation. The AUCCTU has prepared its own alternative draft of the Basic Legislation on the Employment of the Populace and has forwarded it to the central economic organs. We ask the AUCCTU members to study this document critically and to state their observations. If the state organs do not accept the proposals of the trade unions, we could submit this draft to the USSR Supreme Soviet, following its revision and with your consent. Speeding up the adoption of this law should become a priority task of the people's deputies from the USSR trade unions.

In essence, the proposed draft of the Basic Legislation calls for the state to guarantee ensuring the right of citizens to work and implementation of the policy of full employment, including the right to a free choice of one's profession and kind of employment, free vocational orientation, training and retraining, and professional improvement.

Of course, direct participation by the trade unions in developing, implementing, and monitoring the implementation of measures for ensuring employment should also be envisaged. We are going to insist on the principle of trilateral participation in solving the problems of employment (trade unions, government, management, and entrepreneurs). It should be stressed that we did not think up this principle. The International Labor Organization recommended it in a number of conventions, including those ratified by the USSR.

Another group of equally complicated issues is associated with the continuing deterioration of the situation in the consumer market. Two problems have become distinctly apparent in this matter: shortages and unbridled prices. The transition to a market economy may, perhaps, facilitate a pick-up in the national economy and saturation of the consumer market. However, this question is important for us: At what price?

It is clear that these processes will proceed painfully, that significant trials await us along this path. The policy of switching to free market relations by the method of shock treatment pursued in, for example, Poland has brought about the growth of prices by 650 percent in that country in 1989, and a monthly inflation rate of 50 percent; the number of people who end up below the poverty line has been increasing geometrically. According to the data available, in February of this year alone prices increased by 1,000 percent, or by a factor of 10.

We should learn a lesson based on this bitter truth. In our country, about 80 million people are already experiencing considerable financial difficulties, and further deterioration in their situation may push them into the abyss of poverty.

Judge for yourselves. Even now people with that level of income consume considerably less meat, dairy products, eggs, vegetables, and fruit than the standard calls for.

What awaits these people in the absence of fair social aid?

Preparing and conditioning the populace for the market economy and protecting the low-income strata is the task of not only the government and economic organs but is also an immediate duty of the trade unions.

As we see it, the trade unions should insist specifically on the concept of a market economy regulated by the state, and a gradual transition to the free market of labor and capital, in order to cushion as much as possible the negative influence of these processes on the standard of living of the workers. Whatever the circumstances, we will insist that all the measures aimed at introducing market arrangements that the government expects to take are mandatorily discussed with the trade unions and implemented openly, understandable to the people, and implemented only after consulting the people. After all, the most significant issues of our life are at issue.

This is exactly why we believe that it is necessary to immediately develop and adopt as early as this year, as a first step, an anti-inflationary law, introduce price and income indexing, and establish relevant compensation mechanisms for the low-income population groups, retirees, labor and war veterans, families with many

children, and students. As we see it, they should be adjusted periodically depending on the level of inflation (once a quarter, once every half-year, or in some other manner taking inflation into account). A pertinent draft document developed by the AUCCTU has been handed out to you. We also ask you to make statements on this issue.

There is one more problem that we cannot fail to mention today. A critical situation has developed in the country as far as ensuring healthy and safe occupational conditions in production is concerned. More than 55,000 people died, and more than 100,000 were crippled in the national economy in the four years of the five-year plan. In many types of production, indicators of the condition of the production environment are two, three, or more times lower than the permissible medical norms.

As we see it, the trade unions should make a priority the task of resolutely improving work on ensuring safe conditions in production and making greater demands on the economic organs, managers, and entrepreneurs without any allowances for difficulties and other circumstances, all the more so because our transition to a market economy may exacerbate this problem still more.

The involvement and results of the activities of the trade unions aimed at occupational safety depend to a decisive degree on the position and adherence of trade union committees to principles, and the support for their efforts from the councils and central committees of the trade unions. We cannot agree with those who propose to transfer occupational safety functions to the state together with technical inspection. This means one thing—depriving trade unions of the right, opportunity, and duty to defend the interests of workers in the main sphere, the sphere of labor.

In this precongress period the trade unions are called upon to fight for speeding up the adoption and implementation of the laws on retirement benefits and leave, the law on the rights of trade unions, for developing a national program to improve the occupational environment, the law on the protection of labor, and improvement of the labor law, that is all the measures and decisions that just cannot be postponed.

In conjunction with this the AUCCTU Presidium believes that it is feasible to propose to the USSR Government on behalf of the AUCCTU Plenum that it annually sign social agreements with the trade union center of the country on a series of socioeconomic issues, that is, a national collective agreement of sorts.

Comrades!

We did not set for ourselves the task of reflecting or even outlining in this report all the issues of our trade union movement. We have "left out" the spiritual sphere, the ideological work of the trade unions, the issues of housing, the sphere of consumer services, and social security. All of the above and many other topics are the subject of serious work before the congress and of a large, detailed discussion at the congress.

Therefore, comrades, we are entering a very complex period which is crucial for the trade unions. The eighth plenum is a threshold beyond which a new concept of trade unions and the draft program documents of the 19th congress will be submitted for judgment to many millions of workers.

We will realize, develop, and find approaches to a radical restructuring of the entire trade union movement, our entire activities. At the same time, we need to continuously step up our efforts to protect the legitimate interests of workers at present, when they need this most.

I would like to stress that the stability of society and attaining national accord depend to a considerable degree on us, the largest organization of workers. We cannot allow confrontation, separatism, or attempts to split the trade union movement on a regional, branch, or some other basis within the trade unions themselves.

The processes of democratization have brought and will bring a variety of forms and methods to our work. One thing will not change—the strength of the trade unions is in their unity and the consolidation of their various detachments; only strong trade unions are capable of defending the working man. This has been proven by centuries of history of the international workers' movement. This is why the slogan of unity, rallying our forces, trade union solidarity, defense of the rights of workers, and making the trade unions more militant are not abstract notions for us. We will proceed to the 19th Congress of USSR Trade Unions with this slogan.

The very final point.

We would like to seek your advice on the best way to structure the work of our plenum. The issues we are going to discuss are important in principle.

The AUCCTU Presidium proposes to adopt a decision on convening the congress, the date for holding it, and the rate of representation at today's meeting following a discussion. We should reach agreement in order to embark on preparing the 19th Congress of the USSR Trade Unions without delay.

At the same time it is proposed not to adjourn the proceedings of the plenum today, and to assemble again in May. Taking into account today's discussion, the editorial commission of the plenum may within days revise the draft of procedures for electing delegates to the USSR trade union congress, come up with the final wording of the draft declaration and the main principles, and forward these drafts and all other documents associated with preparations for the 19th Congress of USSR Trade Unions to you in the field in order to consult the trade union organizations and trade union aktiv.

This approach will help us adopt more balanced and thought-through decisions at the second meeting of the

Eighth AUCCTU Plenum in May, and enrich the program documents that will be submitted to the congress of trade unions of our country.

Russian Official Calls for Migration Service

LD2604202890 Moscow TASS in English 1532 GMT 26 Apr 90

[By TASS correspondent Anatoliy Aladinsky]

[Text] Moscow April 26 TASS—The Soviet Union faces a new challenge: refugees as a social category of the population. More than half a million people have already had to abandon their homes as a result of inter-ethnic conflicts.

In Moscow alone, 41,000 refugees were registered from January 17 to March 25 of this year. Among them are 18,000 Russians, 15,000 Armenians and 8,000 people of other nationalities.

About 6,500 refugees have been given accommodiation in health centres and vacation retreats in Moscow region and other nearby regions. About 2,000 people, mainly Armenians, live in Moscow hotels, many of them for over a year.

Dozens of families apply every day to centres that have been specially set up at ministries and departments to handle refugee employment matters. Only 2,500 of them have been given new jobs and housing. Refugees are mainly given make-shift housing (hostels of various types), although permanent housing, including a self-contained apartment, is provided in a number of cases.

A large influx of people from Azerbaijan showed that administration agencies are not prepared to tackle matters concerning the reception, accommodation, and employment of refugees, to aid them or to provide housing.

According to Anatoly Blokhin, chairman of the Russian Federation's State Committee for Labour and Social Affairs, it has long been necessary to set up a special migration service in the country, under the authority of the USSR Council of Ministers, with legislatively determined rights and powers.

Such a service would tackle matters primarily concerning the use of financial and material resources, and the guidance and coordination of work at all levels from all-union down to district. Similar agencies must be set up in republics, regions and districts, he maintains.

Already now it is essential to furnish legislative, financial and housing resources in order to deal with problems associated with enforced migration, Blokhin emphasised.

A state programme is necessary to provide social and economic amenities to those who had to abandon the places of their permanent residence, he added.

However bitter it is to realise, there is an urgent need for a statute on refugees. At present cannot call anyone a refugee in a document because there is no such category in Soviet legislative acts.

It is necessary to take into account that a number of resolutions have recently been taken about regions where inter-ethnic relations have become strained. But each resolution spelled out partial decisions that do not cover all the issues actually arising from the situation.

It is now essential to work out a single legislative act, and government documents arising from it, to deal with problems of enforced migration.

Inaccurate Moscow Crime Statistics Revealed

90UN1158A Moscow TRUD in Russian 12 Mar 90 p 3

[Article by A. Vasilyev and B. Pavlov: "The Risk Zone"]

[Text] Pistol shots rang out one day in February on a side street near Morozovskiy Children's Hospital: A man rushed out of a car that was stopped there and ran toward the entrance to the hospital's grounds and someone was firing at the runner from the other car....

At the doctors' request, we contacted the Mosgorispolkom GUVD [Internal Affairs Main Administration] press center and asked them to provide us with details about what occurred during the shooting during broad daylight. How surprised we were when Ye. Ryabtsev, a press-center official, told us that the incident was not recorded in the Petrovka 38 [Militia Office] situation report. Furthermore, he suggested that what dozens of witnesses perceived to be gunfire was the sound of a car backfiring!

Just what is happening on the streets of our cities right now? This question was posed by TRUD correspondents who decided to study the crime situation using Moscow as an example. Every day 4 million visitors are added to the 8 million Moscow residents. Unfortunately, not all of them arrive in the capitol to admire the historical monuments or to make necessary purchases. Moscow also attracts law violators of every stripe: From ordinary hooligans and small-time speculators to especially dangerous recidivists. Therefore, here, problems linked with this social evil are seen as if under a magnifying glass.

From USSR MVD [Ministry of Internal Affairs] statistical summary: The trend toward a reduction in the growth rate of street crime noted in July 1989 is being maintained. The dynamics of its individual types in 1989 totaled: premeditated murder and attempted premeditated murder—2,593; aggravated assault—13,033; rape and attempted rape—2,525....

And so, a reduction? However, there are grounds to believe that the statistics do not entirely reflect the actual situation.

To verify this assumption, we decided to drive to the Moscow hospitals where patients who have been injured

on the streets go after being attacked. In each such medical facility there is a special book with information about the victims, the nature of the trauma, and the arrival time at the reception area. All of this information is reported to the nearest militia office from which an investigator or an agent should arrive to take immediate steps, that is, to find and detain those who beat up, robbed, or stabbed a passerby.

The first address—is City Clinical Hospital No. 29 on Hospital Square. Judging by the book, on the first day of the new year of 1990, the following people arrived here:

—At 4:15, worker V. Aleksandrov with a penetrating knife wound in the abdominal cavity. An unidentified person attacked him in the area of Federativnyy Prospekt.

—At 5:20, Student Sergey Zh. was driven here from Aviamotornyy Street. Two unidentified people beat him up and stabbed him in the shoulder and chest.

—At 7:30, Aleksandr Z., a driver for a transportation enterprise, was found near house No. 11 on Fryazenskiy Street with a stab wound on his forearm. He had been stabbed with a knife.

There are also a multitude of entries about "ordinary" fractured jaws, broken noses, concussions, and dislocated arms in this sad book.

At the First Aid Institute imeni Sklifosovskiy, we were told that just last year over 2,000 people were brought here from the streets.... And after practically every name was the postscript: "Beat up by unidentified person or persons".

"And the majority of the patients," says Hospital No. 29 Deputy Chief Doctor L. Sorokin, "already do not believe in the militia's ability to protect them."

Near the Oktyabrskoe Pole Metro Station, a group of thugs who were smoking hashish attacked a father and his small son who were returning home after visiting someone. Something occurred that is unusual for our times—passersby came to their aid, subdued the riff-raff, and took them to the nearest militia office.

What happened next? Were the young men prosecuted and sentenced to a prison term? No. Were the parents each fined a large amount of money? No. The militia sent the hooligans home having "punished" them by saying that they would tell their parents what had happened. So, where is the guarantee that these big schoolboys, languishing in idleness, will not once again try to find adventure, but this time armed with knives and brass knuckles? And then no one will manage to respond to the victim's heart-rending wail: The militia will not rush to the calls of "Help me!" The militia will not rush to the old-fashioned call "Guard!" since we all know that the guard does not walk along dark side streets. And there are not enough of them on all dark streets.

"I am convinced that far from all similar incidents end up in the statistics," continues Sorokin. "And do you know why? Let us say this incident occurs—A man is returning home after visiting [friends]. He probably also had dinner. By the way, there is a Form No. 94 on which we record the state of drunkenness. With this information, the victim is automatically deprived of the right for payment of the hospital bill and is threatened with unpleasantness at work. Therefore, very often, having received a serious injury, a person does not immediately come to the doctor or to the militia but waits until the alcohol 'wears off.' How can we talk about solving a crime 'by its hot clues'!

"No, we are not protecting drunks, but we are sure of one thing: We need to sort out each specific case individually. A man who has drunk a couple of glasses of champagne at a wedding or at a birthday party should not be deprived of the right to protection under the law...."

The next person we talked to, I. Zakharov, head of the trauma department of Hospital 67, confirmed our observations: Even here in Voroshilovskiy Rayon street injuries are growing in all directions. However, when we compared the entries in the doctors' book with entries about crime and incidents at the 124th Militia Office next to the hospital, it turned out that there were no criminal charges brought against any hooligans—people who like to taunt passers-by, "punch them in the face," and "cut their faces"!

Why? Is it not because any assault against an individual who declares a violation to us is not punished, strictly or not strictly, it is not punished and any good-for-nothing is certain: He more often than not will not be punished and he is not threatened with the inevitability of being brought to justice.

Yes, that is why. But there are other explanations, too. It became clear from frank conversations with district militia officers, investigators, and agents: First of all, they themselves have no vested interest in an investigation. Three to four similar cases "hang" over each of them. Naturally they are primarily engaged with incidents where knives or firearms have been used. An ordinary "fight" is simply recorded, and that is why the judicial qualification of Article 206 of the RSFSR's UK [criminal code] (which provides mandatory filing of a criminal case for hooliganism) is being changed to Article 112, which envisions being taken directly to court without conducting a preliminary investigation. The complainants do not bring the matter to court: With time, some become apprehensive and become reconciled with what took place, others fear revenge from their attackers, and still others frankly do not believe that they will solve anything [by going to court]. Thus, cases are being closed and the number of victims is increasing!

Here are just two examples taken at random from situation reports for four days:

—Two 16 year-old ne'er-do-wells catch an eighth grader on the street, they drag her into an attic, and there they rape her....

—On Stromynka Street, militia officers seize a homemade pistol and rounds from a Makarov from two ignorant young men.

Of course, you can curse the militia and justifiably demand that it immediately restore order. But this is what Major V. Manukyan of the 132nd Militia Office told us:

"We need only detain a hooligan and 'society' rises up. Recently we attempted to calm down a drunk near a wine store who was trying to abuse passersby. Thus, the entire line came to his defense and, encouraged by the attention, the brawler rushed to attack the militiaman. He struck the militiaman."

It is impossible to imagine this occurring, for example, in the United States, England, or France where the police, who personify the law and law and order, are inviolable.

Criminal statutes that provide punishment for resisting militiamen or for assaulting them when they are carrying out their duties should very strictly and unfailingly operate in our country where we are experiencing shortcomings in the militia ranks because of low pay and because of which a citizen is not guaranteed personal safety. Alas, they frequently do not turn out in practice. We also need a law on militia so that all citizens know it!

Today many people are talking about creating a municipal militia that is subordinate to local councils. There certainly is some common sense in these opinions: Let us put it this way, there will be a boss in the square or on the street who is personally responsible for order in his sector—but under the mandatory condition that his work must be assessed not by "satisfactory accounting" but by the actual level of law and order, by how many hooligans, brawlers, and crooks on his territory he deprived of their "professional residence permits." And naturally his pay should correspond to his efforts and the risk. Then maybe we will be able to not recruit but select associates for positions as Soviet "sheriffs" and demand a real return from them.

Police in the developed countries have long since stopped using foot patrols and have replaced them with more efficient automobile patrols. Our own policemen are still measuring off kilometers with their legs. The USSR Supreme Soviet Committee on Privileges decided to transfer some of these former "personal cars" for sale to the population through an auction. But maybe it would be better if these vehicles were given to internal affairs agencies?

Maybe it makes sense to have these agencies themselves establish closer contact with the military commandant's headquarters so that patrols, whose numbers have doubled recently, are not only engaged in "catching" AWOL soldiers and soldiers with unbuttoned shirts but who also are actually helping to maintain public order and to protect city residents from street banditry?

We think TRUD readers who have come to know the scale of the crime wave on city streets through their own experiences can propose dozens of methods and measures to fight crime. Law enforcement agencies can also propose many suggestions. And law professors and legislators.... But it is important, very important, for each of us that the distance be shortened between such proposals and reality before all of our lives are transformed into a risk zone.

New Financial Newspaper Launched in USSR

LD2404042990 Moscow Television Service in Russian 2005 GMT 23 Apr 90

[From the "Television News Service" Program]

[Summary] The first issue of the paper DELOVOY MIR [BUSINESS WORLD] is out. Its print run is 100,000. Mikhail Aleksandrovich Rostarchuk, first deputy of the DELOVOY MIR consortium, the publishers, says the paper is for businessmen. The first issue will be delivered to more than 30,000 enterprises and organizations around the country. We hope to become an all-union daily as of 1 July and a kind of bridge linking businessmen of the East and the West with the Soviet businessmen. We hope to provide all information and become as prestigious as the FINANCIAL TIMES.

MOSCOW MAGAZINE To Appear in May

LD2704221190 Moscow TASS in English 2154 GMT 27 Apr 90

[Text] Moscow April 28 TASS—A "Moscow Magazine", which will begin to be published in English and Russian in May, was presented at the World Trade Centre here on Friday.

The founders of the magazine are the Moscow organisation of the USSR Journalists' Union, the International Commercial Bank for the Development of Wholesale Trade and the Association of Dutch Publishing Firms.

The 100-page magazine is richly illustrated. Its first issue, brought up for public notice, deals with trade and business relations between the Soviet Union and Western countries.

The magazine carries articles by prominent Western and Soviet economists, comprehensive business information and news, advice by foreign businessmen, interviews and feature stories about those who work in the Soviet Union as well as fresh information about Soviet legislation in this field.

Economic

Scope, Impact of Price Reform Discussed

904A0314A Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
13 Apr 90 Second Edition p 2

[Interview with V.K. Senchagov, chairman of the USSR State Committee for Prices, by PRAVDA correspondent A. Fedotov; date and place not specified: "Prices: Today and Tomorrow"]

[Text] As is known, the government is working on a set of urgent measures associated with our transition to a planned market economy. Fundamental changes in our price policy are a part of this package. A PRAVDA correspondent discussed their main directions with Vyacheslav Konstantinovich Senchagov, chairman of the USSR State Committee for Prices.

[Fedotov] A figurative remark to the effect that a market, that is, market relations, is no bazaar sticks in my memory. The picture of existing prices which largely resembles a bazaar has emerged in our country. How will the price policy change in the course of switching from a poorly organized bazaar to a civilized market?

[Senchagov] The thrust of the new policy is exactly to have prices become an organic part of an emerging regulated market economy (I am not a proponent of the "planned market" notion), to turn from a neglected stepdaughter into a pillar of the economy, to become a bridge connecting effective demand with flexible, timely supply. Essentially, the point is to regroup and reorient our entire system of prices—procurement, wholesale, and retail—toward the market.

Taking into account the specifics and role of particular products in economic circulation, three types of prices are expected to be introduced—state prices, regulated prices, and free prices. Quite naturally the state will retain the authority to set prices for basic products that affect the overall economic situation in our country and the level of retail prices. These are crude oil, gas, coal, ferrous metals, electricity, and so on.

At present their prices are between one-half and one-third of both world and domestic costs. Judge for yourselves: A ton of crude oil in the world market costs R86 if conversion is done at the USSR State Bank rate, whereas in the domestic market it is R31.

Unfortunately this low price is illusory. If we want to participate in the international division of labor as partners rather than observers, domestic prices should take the proportions of world prices into account.

What I am driving at is—exactly!—the imperative, reasonable need to substantially increase fees for fuel and energy resources. Incidentally, this will be fair as far as the exchange of goods and money between various regions is concerned: Why should those who produce resources paid for with labor and sweat get peanuts for them?

Along with stable state prices, regulated prices will be used extensively. Depending on the efficiency of production and the ratio of demand and supply, they may drop or increase but not beyond a certain "ceiling" specified in the price list. Contract prices used at present are something of a prototype of such prices.

[Fedotov] At present, the economy is out of balance to such a degree that virtually everything is in short supply: I would be glad to pay more but there is nothing available. It looks like free prices formed on the basis of demand and supply are a way out of the situation. However, in all honesty, ultra-radical suggestions to switch overnight to the supply-and-demand prices for all goods at the same time do not find favor with me, a person who has no money for a rainy day.

[Senchagov] Given our current situation, I believe that even this variant should not be rejected flatly, without prior analysis. However, the social price of a "shock" transition to the desired market may quite possibly turn out to be excessive and will transcend the limit of social tolerance. Multiple "injections" of wages, grants, and retirement benefits will be required, and the state will be under attack from all quarters....

This is why I am in favor of moderate, balanced radicalism, in favor of the transition to market-based pricing being implemented with a cool, clear mind rather than rashly. To this end, the goods need to be correctly "classified" by the type of price (free, regulated, state), and precisely verified proportions should be worked out.

[Fedotov] The forthcoming price reform was announced for the first time in 1987, in the resolutions of the June plenum of the Party Central Committee; it was noted that an increase in retail prices will not affect family budgets: The harm done to the budgets will be fully reimbursed by the state. What can we say about this now, three years later? Can I, my family, and millions of other families count on complete compensation if retail trade puts a dent in not-so-high incomes?

[Senchagov] We may only say what is true, and the complete truth leaves us without illusions: In these years the situation in the national economy has not only failed to improve but has deteriorated. Not just our finance and currency circulation are in disarray but also the circulation of all material assets. Production, the ultimate foundation of any economic organism, has been declining. Meanwhile, remunerations have been increasing right before our eyes. Cooperatives are not at all the only issue. They have been jacking up the wages as best they could for miners, scientists, and management employees. The government and party apparatus has rushed to join the remuneration race.

It is with this balance of forces that we are approaching the planned price reform. At present, it is just impossible to fully offset retail price increases.

[Fedotov] However, there has got to be some compensation, because quite a few people are not in a position to shoulder the burden of high new prices.

[Senchagov] We have a duty to guarantee complete compensation to those whose standard of living is at or below the poverty line. These are primarily retirees, students, families with many children, a large contingent of teachers, health care workers, and so on. Indeed, a sharp acceleration of price increases is an excessive burden for them. It is necessary to compensate these people at once and in full for the growing cost of their already poor living.

Another group which is close to the above consists of people whose affluence is below-average or average, who have a job, and some of whom have opportunities to make extra money. We may call on them to appreciate the situation and agree to only partial compensation. It is important to set the limit of compensation correctly.

Finally, the third group consists of above-average and highly paid employees. As I see it, this group will have to absorb the entire growing cost of living. A market economy offers to the people of this group good prospects for a creative quest, the development of their abilities, and pursuit of commercial interests, including in joint enterprises and cooperatives.

I would like to make a reservation: This concept is just one of the possible variants. Its advantages and drawbacks have yet to be carefully examined.

[Fedotov] Will this forced separation between the two last groups bring about leveling? Some people will have to patch up the holes in their budgets through their own labor, whereas partial compensation will be provided to others for their losses without any input of labor.

[Senchagov] This is an issue. After all, the third group does not at all consist of "shadow types" (shadow economy operators are not at all eager to declare their incomes), but for the most part the most gifted, talented segment of our society. However, this is exactly what gives us reason to think that temporary losses for businesslike, intelligent specialists who can work hard will not last long. They will recoup the loss through their earnings.

On the other hand, the second group should not hibernate either. It needs to take into account the fact that the state does not have an opportunity to pay continuously for the growth of prices. At issue is one-time compensation, compensation as of the moment of our transition to new, free prices. In the future, everyone will have to proceed from the obvious truth: A better product costs more.

[Fedotov] It is known that the slower wholesale, procurement, and retail prices grow the better the system of economic regulation is. From this point of view, what future awaits us once we introduce market relations?

[Senchagov] By all signs, taking the present situation into account, the rate of growth of prices will increase appreciably. The task is to bring their annual growth within the bounds characteristic of a healthy, dynamic economy, that is, around two to three percent. However, in this instance growth is going to occur in a qualitatively different, saturated market of goods.

[Fedotov] Pardon me, when will all of this hit?

[Senchagov] The government is now working at an accelerated pace on a set of measures whose objective is to bring closer the time of our transition to a planned market economy. This is an entire package of draft laws and resolutions, without which the "viability" of the market will not be assured. A very exacting schedule has been adopted. At any rate, the goal is this: to begin switching to the market as soon as this year.

Personally, I see no other realistic way to overcome the crisis. Procrastinating and counting on a miracle would amount to self-delusion. When you stand on the brink of an abyss you must think about a bridge.

Nikitin Reviews 1st Quarter Economic Performance

904A0316A Moscow PRAVITELSTVENNYY VESTNIK in Russian No 15, Apr 90 pp 1, 3

[Report on interview with V.V. Nikitin, first deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, by Central Television political correspondent L.A. Voznesenskiy: "A Drastic Stage Lies Ahead;" date and place not specified, first paragraph is PRAVITELSTVENNYY VESTNIK introduction]

[Text] March is over. The calendar shows the second month of spring. But today we do not check our mood only against the weather. The situation in the economic sphere and the state of affairs in the consumer market are becoming decisive factors in the psychological climate. There is still scant comfort here. In an interview with Central Television political correspondent L.A. Voznesenskiy, V.V. Nikitin, the first deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, talks about the situation that has taken shape in the national economy.

[Voznesenskiy] Valentin Valentinovich, what did March bring for our national economy?

[Nikitin] In March the conditions for the operation of the national economy were even more complicated than during the two preceding months. The reduced volumes of industrial output in January and February had their effect. Hence the failure to deliver resources under the terms of contractual obligations. The economy suffered no little harm from the interethnic conflicts and the close down of a number of enterprises on instructions from local organs.

For example, the halting of operations at the Berdyanskiy plant that produces synthetic fatty acids and interruptions at the Sumgait "Khimprom" Association paralyzed the work of hundreds of other enterprises. The

total shortfall in industrial output was about R2.5 billion. So that the results of work for the first quarter cannot be called satisfactory.

Let me remind you that compared to the same period last year, during the first two months of this year there was a decline of one percent in daily average output. In March this grew 0.8 percent. But, taking into account the fact that there were fewer working days in March, the total volume of industrial output fell 1.7 percent against last year's figures.

The quite steady trend toward a decline in the recovery of oil and coal and slower growth in the generation of electricity are a cause of particular concern. For these are the main indicators that determine the operation of the entire national economy.

[Voznesenskiy] What is happening with consumer goods? Are there any real positive shifts here?

[Nikitin] Compared with the previous month, during March the production of consumer goods rose by R3 billion. In particular, the buildup continued in the production of complex domestic appliances and a number of other goods.

We are expecting a great deal from enterprises in the defense complex. And they are already making themselves felt. In this sphere growth rates for consumer goods rose 21 percent during the quarter against last year's level.

Things are not as good in light industry, where the output of fabrics and footwear is falling. Thus, during the first quarter 73 million square meters of fabric less than last year were produced, and the figure for footwear was 4 million pairs less, which is more than 5 percent. Output of knitted articles is not increasing.

[Voznesenskiy] What can you say about the situation that has developed today in supplying basic foodstuffs?

[Nikitin] During March the production volume for foodstuffs increased R1 billion compared to February. Notwithstanding, planned growth rates were not achieved. Shortages of raw materials for the processing industry, and also reduced imports, had their effect. In particular, the output of canned fruit and vegetables declined because of shortages of the raw materials—grapes and fruits with pits. Imports of citrus juice from Cuba declined. Because of hard currency shortages we had to cut back on imports.

As far as hothouse vegetables are concerned their production fell because they have started to grow in cold frames more of the crops that enjoy demand. And at the same time there was a decline in the production of cucumbers and onions, which also used to yield increased gross production.

[Voznesenskiy] Of course, most of all people are experiencing the shortages of livestock farming produce. How do we explain this major decline in the production and procurement of these products during March? What is being done to correct the matter?

[Nikitin] This is not so. The production and procurement of milk not only did not decline but even increased during March—by 200,000 tons, and in all over the quarter, by 500,000 tons, or three percent. But if we talk about procurements of cattle and poultry, then their production did decline during March by 180,000 tons, or three percent. The reason for this was the reduced grain imports. And this is lowering output at specialized complexes operating on state fodders, while the kolkhozes [collective farms] and sovkhozes [state farms] have still been unable to compensate for this decline.

Naturally, today all the people are deeply worried about the situation in the food market. I recently had to answer questions from deputies in the USSR Supreme Soviet. These are all complicated issues. But answers to them must be found. I think that one of the decisive factors should be finding solutions to urgent social problems.

It is also essential that the price for output produced by the peasants should cover the socially necessary costs and enable expanded reproduction to take place.

[Voznesenskiy] What happened in March in the preparations for sowing? How did it go in the regions where the sowing has started?

In many parts of the country field work has already started. And three or four weeks earlier than the average time for many years. By the beginning of April the sowing of early grain crops had already been completed in the North Caucasus, Krasnodar, and Stavropol Krays, part of Rostov Oblast, and the southern and western Oblasts of the Ukraine and Moldavia.

It should be said that in the main farming has been fully supplied with seeds for the spring sowing. The quality is better than last year: 85 percent of first or second class. Seeds for potatoes, commercial, and vegetable crops and grasses have all been supplied.

The basic equipment is ready for operation. But it should be noted that repairs have been significantly more difficult this year. The shortages of spare parts have had their effect.

[Voznesenskiy] Why is this, and who is to blame?

[Nikitin] The reason is that some enterprises are showing lack of discipline in their deliveries. This year things have been made worse by the closure of a number of plants.

It is common knowledge that in previous years throughout the period of field work, agriculture has suffered from fuel shortages. The situation is better now and there are some reserves.

Things are not so good with deliveries of mineral fertilizers and plant protection agents and polyethylene sheeting. Incidentally, because of the closure of Soviet

enterprises producing polyethylene we have lost about 36,000 tons of it, but the needs of agriculture for the quarter amount to 30,000 tons. The government has had to make additional expenditures to acquire this amount from abroad.

[Voznesenskiy] Given the extremely tense situation in the economy, fulfillment of the monthly plan largely determines the plan for the quarter, while fulfillment of the plan for the quarter largely determines the plan for the year. If you agree with this assertion, how are we oriented from the results of the first quarter?

[Nikitin] The results of work in the national economy for the first quarter also indicate that the adverse trends are being maintained, but at the same time there are some factors that give cause for hope. Conversion is gathering strength. There have also been advances in the formation of regional consumer markets. With the renewal of the soviets and the extension of their powers more complete use is being made of local reserves.

However, all of this can play a role only given the stabilization of money circulation. Stricter control is needed over budget spending and the efficient use of credit investments. There must be every possible buildup in the production of consumer goods. In other words, we must reduce the time taken through perestroyka to transfer the economy to market relations.

[Voznesenskiy] Yes, we now hear more clearly the thought that there is a need to accelerate the transfer to these kinds of economic links....

[Nikitin] The government program for improving the economy plans on 1993-1995 as the period for the transfer. The government believes that this period must be brought forward and that we must seek out an effective mechanism for the transfer. March was an active month in this search.

A meeting took place in the Council of Ministers on ways to effect the transfer to a planned market economy. Some 60 plant and enterprise directors and sovkhoz and kolkhoz chairmen were invited to it. And not only from leading enterprises but also from weak ones. It was agreed that work to accelerate the transfer to market relations must be done, but that first it is necessary to resolve certain legal issues. And the main thing that needs improvement is the banking and financial system. Certain provisions must be made in law on enterprises and a tax system is needed. Assignments have been issued on all these issues and they are acquiring the form of legal documents and will be adopted in the very near future.

A meeting has taken place with workers in financial and banking organs. Here they discussed the same subject and outlined a clear- cut program of action. It was decided in the very near future to create a network of commercial banks. A determination was made on how to raise the rate for credit and how to establish financial control over the way in which loans are used.

The chairman of the Council of Ministers has also taken counsel with the leaders of the supply organizations. They reviewed questions of material-technical support for production.

During March the USSR Council of Ministers passed a resolution on the procedure for handing over enterprises for leasing and it reviewed questions concerning stock companies and the issue of securities. In particular, procedure was established for leasing all-union enterprises with or without an option to buy, in all sectors of material production and the nonproduction sphere except for defense enterprises, transport, the fuel and energy complex, and communications.

[Voznesenskiy] In the activity of the government of a country as large as ours there is perhaps no month that does not have awkward situations that have to be dealt with outside the plan. Were there such situations in March, and were these matters the subject of government review?

[Nikitin] I would like particularly to emphasize the importance of the decisions reached on providing help for refugees. Today, unfortunately, their numbers exceed 600,000. All citizens who have been forced to leave their places of residence are being given urgent assistance and cash grants and clothing, footwear and other necessities, and they are being compensated for losses incurred from their former places of residence. Housing is being found for refugees and food and medical care are being organized for them and teaching for the children.

A session of the commission that deals with emergency situations reviewed the question of implementing measures to improve the ecological and sanitation situation in the Aral Sea. A draft state program was also approved for environmental protection and the rational use of natural resources in the country through the year 2005. Together with the councils of ministers of Russia, the Ukraine and Belorussia, preparations are nearing completion for an all-Union and republic program for the cleanup following the accident at the Chernobyl nuclear power station.

At the start of this interview I noted that the government is concerned about the trend toward reduced oil recovery. The leaders of drilling and oil-and-gas recovery associations recently met with the chairman of the Council of Ministers to define measures to find a solution to this very complicated situation. The oil people have not been receiving all the equipment they need from the machine builders or the foodstuffs supplied by the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic Council of Ministers, and the construction workers owe them housing. The meeting was stormy and there were many proposals.

Dialogue shows over and over again that power engineering needs constant and unremitting attention

because today it determines national economic development. Additional investments will be made and appropriate steps taken to stabilize life, particularly in Tyumen Oblast.

To sum up our interview I would like to return once again to the fact that the government is of the firm opinion that it is necessary to bring forward the schedule for the transfer to market relations. It is essential that the economic laws be worked out more quickly. Today this is the main thing.

Need for Accelerating Reforms Analyzed

904A0318A Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
16 Apr 90 Second Edition p 2

[Article by Yegor Gaydar, PRAVDA editor of the Department of Economic Policy: "Fast Track to the Market"]

[Text] While defending a program of invigorating the economy toward the end of last year, N.I. Ryzhkov referred to suggestions for making a transition to a market economy in 1990 and 1991 as foolhardy, noting that this step would bring about a crisis, the extent of which can hardly be imagined. Exactly four months later, on 14 April 1990, the Presidential Council and the Federation Council began to discuss at a joint meeting a package of measures on radicalizing the reform, which was submitted by the USSR Council of Ministers. At issue is exactly a fast move to the market economy. What has forced this decisive change in view on the outlook of economic policy?

The program of invigorating the economy was the result of an entire series of compromises between the proponents of markedly different concepts of restructuring the system of economic operations. One does not even need to know the intimate underpinnings of its preparation; attentively familiarizing yourself with the text would suffice. In the text proposals aimed at ensuring the organized, orderly development of the reform are intertwined with hopes to resume the use of old, proven administrative arrangements.

Compromise is not necessarily a dirty word in politics, which is called upon to reconcile contradictory interests. However, in this case the decisions that appeared as a result of this compromise had one fundamental flaw: They definitely failed to take into account the actual situation in our country. It was proposed to reduce the state budget deficit sharply and by no means touch the rapidly growing subsidies for the agroindustrial complex; to slow down the growth of the monetary income of the populace and initiate large-scale social programs; to develop market regulations consistently and make administrative control over prices stricter.

In a word, the entire program was built on belief in a miracle which will make it possible to resolve irreconcilable contradictions. This miracle was precisely quantifiable: In our dysfunctional economy, unprecedented growth of the production of consumer goods (by R66 billion) was expected.

The first blow to the government program was struck before it even took effect. We have already gotten used to our failures to meet deadlines for the commissioning of the most significant construction projects, to investment resources being tied up in projects forever under way. Yet the scope of failure of the 1989 construction program was exceptional even against this background. Our hope to commission on a massive scale capacities for producing consumer goods became increasingly unrealistic.

The results of the first months of this year revealed with complete clarity the weakness of envisaged financial measures and their inadequacy for the purposes of stabilizing monetary circulation. Contributions to the budget from profits continued to decline rapidly. Increments in the sale of alcohol accounted for more than one-half of the growth of turnover tax. Under pressure from the trade unions, a number of decisions called upon to take the burden off the budget (increased tariffs for freight hauling and prices for diesel fuel) had to be rescinded. Pressure from enterprises compelled provisions for so many loopholes in taxes on the increment of wages that it virtually ceased to be in effect for most of the national economy.

Instead of beginning to drop, the rate of growth of money supply increased sharply, reinforcing inflationary pressure in the economy. As any competent economist knows, such pressure manifests itself either in accelerated price increases or, if the government attempts to freeze prices by administrative methods, in greater shortages.

A clear-cut choice emerged: To attempt to pursue a policy whose inevitable failure was becoming increasingly clear, or to take a resolute turn and radicalize the economic reform. The government came out in favor of the latter alternative.

As far as can be understood on the basis of information already released to the public, at issue are free enterprise, the release of property by the state, accelerated transition to market adjustments, unfreezing wholesale and retail prices for the bulk of products, giving enterprises genuine independence in developing their production programs and a system of economic contacts, a sharp reduction of the sphere of application of state orders and their placement on the basis of mutual interests of the parties and emerging market prices. References are also made to the organization of a financial market, mass transformation of large enterprises into joint-stock companies, and steps toward ensuring the convertibility of the ruble—and all of this not in the remote and not-so-realistic future but in the coming months.

The government proposes to take the risk entailed by burdensome, unpopular, but internally consistent measures aimed at restructuring the system of economic operations, to tap incentives for increasing the efficiency of production, and to introduce partial wage indexation which makes it possible to protect the interests of the least affluent population groups.

The proposals under discussion have at least one serious advantage—they are honest. Our society is no longer offered a garden of Eden, a stream of merchandise which is about to flood our desolate store shelves. Everything comes at a price in the economy. By now much has accumulated in payment for hesitation, indecision, and financial irresponsibility. The time when our economy could be stabilized without burdensome, unpopular measures is gone.

It is hard, virtually impossible to predict precisely what the rate of evident inflation is going to be if this scenario is opted for. Likewise it is hard to predict by how much the volume of production will have to be reduced during a period of inevitable restructuring, or at what rate those employed in the types of production being cut back will be let go. However, this time the government is prepared to say bluntly that social collisions along this path cannot be avoided.

Some common features of the government proposals and the "Balcerowicz plan" which is being implemented in Poland (first, the unfreezing of prices and subsequently financial stabilization) create the impression that in our country as well they expect to use the tactic of shock treatment in controlling inflation.

This is not quite so. The essence of shock treatment is not at all found in unfreezing prices (in a number of cases, they need to be frozen), but in sharply reducing total demand. It differs from more conservative recommendations which the experts of the International Monetary Fund usually make in that reductions in the deficit of the state budget and the rate of growth of money supply are ensured within several weeks rather than one and a half to two years. This approach is lucrative due to the opportunity to achieve immediate results, but it also poses particularly harsh requirements for the government that tries to use it. Inconsistencies and departures from the course taken condemn it to immediate failure.

In my opinion, at present this choice would reflect the courage of desperation and a hope to arrest decay in the economy in any manner whatsoever rather than a sober-minded realization of one's own strength. After all, you cannot refer to a government that agrees to pay money for strikes as a strong one.

Unfortunately, political uncertainty is reflected in the logic of the reforms proposed. It is frightening to unfreeze prices given the current rate of growth of money supply. However, this can be done by a momentary decision. All we need to do is close our eyes tight and plunge into the unknown. It is already becoming clear that it is not at all simple to reduce the state budget deficit and slow down the operation of the printing press, given increasing claims by social groups, industries, and regions. Political will and extensive public support are necessary.

Free market prices which keep demand and supply in balance are a marvelous regulator of economic processes. We may cut back the ranks of the army managers who are busy distributing resources in short supply all over the country, make the ruble a full-fledged currency, and fill the shelves of our stores only through the use of such prices. However, their advantages become apparent only on one indispensable condition—financial stability. The entire system of market-based adjustment of the economy becomes dysfunctional when inflation rages in the country, the overall level of prices increases rapidly, and the ratios of prices for various goods change abruptly and unpredictably. The incomes of all social groups turn out to be directly related to how effectively they can pressure the government and the banks and to what degree they can reinforce their demands by genuine threats. Those who fall behind in this race lose. Attempts to slow down the growth of prices through administrative measures bring about an extremely unfavorable combination of high evident inflation and shortages. A situation of economic instability develops. The energy of entrepreneurs is shifted to speculative deals. Investment decisions begin to resemble a game of chance, roulette.

The experience of many countries indicates that this is not the most favorable environment for improving the efficiency of production. The fact that these problems are new for now, unlike customary shortages and the bureaucratization of economic life, does not make them less real. The risk of this turn of events also needs to be taken into account.

Despite the impossibility of preserving the current level of prices in the existing financial situation in principle, fighting price increases is definitely a politically advantageous endeavor. It makes possible an alliance between those who are referred to as conservatives and radicals. It turns out that despite the apparent extensive support for the concept of radicalizing the economic reforms, their social base is not at all firm. It is hard to understand how the government, which turned out to be unable to do anything meaningful for financial stabilization before unfreezing prices, may rigidly oppose tremendous pressure from all quarters and endless demands for still new allocations from the budget after the prices start soaring.

There is no simple solution to this problem, to say nothing of a purely economic one. However, it is significant in principle as far as the future of the government is concerned. As of now, the benchmarks of financial stabilization which it presupposes not only fail to meet the standards of shock treatment, but also the less stringent requirements of an efficient strategy of consistent anti-inflationary policy.

It is proposed to switch from suppressed inflation to evident inflation, subsequently arrest it by reducing the

rate of growth of money supply, and stabilize prices, but already in the environment of a saturated market. We may say very definitively that the latter task is going to be much more difficult to solve than the former.

The Presidential Council and the Federation Council will continue to discuss the government proposals this week. The choice is not going to be easy.

Agricultural

Crop Sowing Statistics, Supply Situation Reported

LD3004094890 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0100 GMT 30 Apr 90

[Text] A regular session of the operational headquarters for material and technical supply to rural areas has taken place at the USSR State Committee for Material and Technical Supply. It was noted that in the run-up to May Day agricultural workers have completed sowing of early grain crops in the Ukraine, Moldavia, Georgia, and the Central Asian republics, as well as in Kuban, Stavropol Kray, Rostov and Belgorod Oblasts. Massive work is now under way on cotton and beet plantations. Sowing of sunflower, rape, vegetables, potatoes, and flax is continuing.

It is comforting that the condition of winter crops is much better than in previous years. Sparse winter crop shoots appeared only in certain areas of the Chernozem and Non-Chernozem Zones and in some parts of Ukraine. And, of course, winter crops will partially have to be sown again.

The headquarters pointed out that this year field work is proceeding in a more organized manner, in spite of the unusually early spring. But the shortcomings in supplies of new machines, spare parts, and other facilities continue to be an obstacle. For example, a major supplier—the Ministry of Motor Vehicles and Agricultural Machine-Building—failed to supply the countryside with over 30,000 tractors from Volgograd, Kharkov, and Tashkent 1,000 Kamaz trucks failed to arrive from Naberezhnyye Chelny. An old ailment—the breach between supplies of threshing machines and harvesters for Don 1500, Yenisey, and Niva combines—is continuing. The Lipetsk tractor factory and motor vehicle plants in the Urals, Mogilev, and Lutsk are refusing to carry out the orders of the agro-industrial complex. This list of enterprises could be continued.

The Ministry of Defense Industry and the Ministry of Heavy Machine—Building are also in debt. Furthermore, Saransk, (Gorodyansk), Kentau, and Kalinin excavator plants have still not concluded contracts on deliveries this year, even though four months have already elapsed. The Southern Machinery Association of the Ministry of General Machine-Building owes over 1,000 tractors. Collective farms, state farms, and processing enterprises are short of electric motors, accumulators, cable, and other goods, deliveries of which are being held up by the Ministry of Electrical Equipment Industry and Instrument-Making.

We have cited examples of the poor work of a number of departments. It should be pointed out that the list of ministries, enterprises, leaders, and collectives which are unconscientious in their attitude to the needs and demands of the peasants is getting shorter. The gradual translation to economic relations is evidently having an effect: Customers and suppliers have started to be more active in finding one another. We shall hope, our commentator writes, that these processes will start to speed up.

Agricultural Developments for 30 April-5 May

LD0605030390

[Editorial Report] The following is a compilation of reports on agricultural developments in the USSR carried by Moscow Domestic Service in Russian on 30 April-5 May. Times of broadcast, given in GMT, are in parentheses at the end of each item.

30 April

Spring sowing has started in Arkhangelsk Oblast. In Belomorye the sowing of barley, oats, leguminous plants, and perennial grasses has begun. Cerials are to be sown on 74,000 ha. (0800)

1-5 May

No significant developments reported.

Scientific

'Progress-42' Cargo Ship Launched

LD0505230790 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 2124 GMT 5 May 90

[Text] [no dateline as received] In line with the program for the further work of the "Mir" scientific and research complex, the launch of the "Progress-42" automatic cargo ship was carried out in the Soviet Union at 0044 [2144 GMT] on 6 May 1990.

The purpose of the ship's launch is to deliver materials that are being depleted and various cargoes to the "Mir" manned complex. The "Progress-42" ship has been placed in an orbit with the parameters:

apogee—261 kilometers;
perigee—194 kilometers;
period of revolution—88.7 minutes;
inclination—51.6 degrees.

According to telemetric information, the on-board systems of the automatic cargo ship are working normally.

Docking With Station Set for 7 May

LD0705091590 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0800 GMT 7 May 90

[Text] The flight of the cargo craft Progress-42, which was launched on Saturday night, continues. It is carrying freight weighing more than two tonnes. According to schedule, the flight path of the cargo craft has been corrected. The working day of the Mir complex crew, cosmonauts Aleksandr Solovyev and Aleksandr Balandin, will be unusually long today, lasting from 0900 on 7 May to 0530 on 8 May. This is in connection with Progress-42's automatic docking with the station that has been scheduled for approximately 0300 [2300 GMT on 7 May].

Features of 'Mir' Station Technology Module

907Q0067A Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 4 Apr 90 First Edition p 3

[Article by Colonel M. Rebrov: "On the Shore of the Ocean of Weightlessness: A New Space Module Being Readied for Launch at Baykonur"]

[Text] Time is flying by at astonishing speed. Fifteen or 20 years ago the very titles "Plants in Space" and "On the Shore of the Ocean of Weightlessness" would have been the prerogative of science fiction writers alone. Serious-minded people preferred not to talk about "space production," but about ordinary production here on earth. Soon everything changed, however, and the words "Vulkan [volcano]," "Splav [alloy]," and "Kristall [crystal]" appeared in our lexicon, filled with space-production meaning. These are the names of the experimental technology units which mark the beginning of our more large-scale orbital laboratories.

The history of technology is replete with examples showing how the employment of new principles led to a radical restructuring of entire branches and brought about great economic benefit, as well as having social effects. We recall the arrival of the jet engine in aviation, the electric train on the railroad line, the birth of atomic energy, the computer, new materials... Space exploration has presented us with fundamentally new opportunities for solving the most pressing problems of our time in the most diverse spheres of science and the national economy. An example of this can be seen in the special-purpose Kristall module, whose launch from Baykonur is tentatively scheduled for 9 April, although this date may change. Following a week-long flight, the module should dock with Mir.

This is considered a technological module—it is intended to conduct an extensive series of experiments and research dealing with the study of materials in space. But this is the scientific portion of the program. There is also an economic side—the beginning of experimental industrial production of high-quality (essentially unique) semiconductor materials to meet the needs of microelectronics. Experts describe the goal of this effort as "a search for optimal parameters in technological processes, allowing us to obtain materials with enhanced characteristics as compared with earth technology, or entirely new materials."

Let me say again that the essence of space technology lies in the fact that the particular conditions existing in near-earth orbit (weightlessness, deep vacuum, space radiation, and other factors) cause a number of physical processes to occur differently in space than they would on earth.

K.E. Tsiolkovskiy was the first to mention "the benefits of space." And the first patent on the use of weightlessness was obtained by the Englishman William Watt. This was over two centuries ago when the very concept of "space" did not exist as we presently understand it. The talented inventor noticed that during the process of free-fall from a high tower, droplets of lead acquired a circular form. The idea that "this is how shot can be cast" flashed through his mind, and he was awarded a patent. Today we know that free-fall can be considered a short-term form of weightlessness...

But let us return to the new module, which can rightly be termed a plant in space. Installed on it are the technological units "Krater-3," "Optizon-1," "Zona 02," and "Zona 03," designed for experimental industrial production of semiconductor materials. There is another apparatus here as well, but it must be treated specially.

And the module itself? Externally it is similar to Kvant-2. Its mass in orbital configuration is 19.5 tons (the launch mass is greater due to fuel). The module casing length is 11.9 meters, maximum diameter—4.35 meters, useful payload delivered into orbit (equipment, etc.)—7 tons.

The module consists of two hermetically sealed compartments—the instrumentation-payload compartment and the junction-docking compartment. There is a juncture hatch between them that is 0.8 meter in diameter. A portion of the "floor" and "ceiling" paneling of the first compartment (as in the Kvant-2 supplementary-equipment module) has been taken up by payload containers for storing food rations.

The second compartment is in the shape of a cylinder joined to a sphere that is 2.2 meters in diameter. Instrumentation units are affixed to the cylinder's internal surface, and the working area of the "sphere" is partially occupied by two docking assemblies. A photographic compartment with camera equipment is installed in place of a third docking assembly.

One further particular feature of the Kristall module—mounted on it are two new APAS-89 androgynous-peripheral docking mechanisms (we recall the APAS-75 which was used for docking our Soyuz spacecraft with the American Apollo in the summer of 1975). Docking and joint operation of the Mir orbital complex with the Buran multiple-use spacecraft is planned for 1991.

Plants in space... No—today this is no longer science fiction. Soviet designers and engineers have built a laser kinescope which uses monocrystalline cadmium sulfide obtained in space. There is nothing analogous to this material on earth with respect to its specifications.

But how much of such materials do we need? The current annual demand by the Ministry of Electronics Industry, the Ministry of Electrical Engineering Industry, and the Ministry of Defense Industry for space-produced materials is measured in tons. The family of semiconductor instruments grows larger year after year. And this process will only keep gathering speed since microelectronics is capable of everything—from running a lathe to controlling a branch of industry. While the productivity of orbital plants is as yet limited to kilograms, a great future looms beyond space technology—its applications promise to provide an economic benefit of 400-800 millioa rubles per year.

And there is more. "Augmenting" the orbital space station is not an end in itself. Insofar as the tasks being accomplished during the research of space are planetary in scope, the significance of international cooperation here is great, more so than in any other sphere. The instrumentation mounted on Mir and two Kvant modules has been built by engineers and scientists of Bulgaria, the GDR, Czechoslovakia, the United States, France, and other countries. The "Rentgen" observatory is rightly termed international. Several expeditions have already taken place with the participation of foreign astronauts on Mir; and we are awaiting the launch of representatives of Austria, Great Britain, Japan, France...

At a March session of the science and technology subcommittee of the United Nations Committee on the Study of Outer Space for Peaceful Purposes, the Soviet Union proposed the conduct of scientific experiments on the Mir station and its modules developed by young scholars and students of the developing countries, in technology, biotechnology and medicine, astrophysics, natural history, the study of radiation in space, etc.

Final preparations at Baykonur have been completed. The Kristall module is on an installation testing block. After a certain amount of time, it will be mounted under the Proton rocket faring, and the launch vehicle itself will be moved out to the launch pad. A telephone conversation with the cosmodrome has confirmed that pre-launch preparations are proceeding as scheduled. We will be reporting the "contact separation" countdown—the hours, minutes, and seconds.

Earth Tremors Registered in Kirghizia

LD0505085290 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0800 GMT 5 May 90

[Text] Frunze, 5 May (TASS)—This morning at 0322 Moscow time, the Central Seismic "Frunze" station of the Seismology Institute of the Academy of Sciences of Kirghizia registered an underground tremor force of 5 in an epicenter [scale not identified]. According to scientists, the epicenter was situated 65 km to the northeast of Osh and 18 km to the northeast of Kok-Yangak town on the southwest slope of the Fergana Range. There are no human losses or damage.

Military

Omelichev Interviewed on Call-Up Status

LD0405203390 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1757 GMT 4 May 90

[Interview with Bronislav Aleksandrovich Omelichev, first deputy chief of the USSR Armed Forces General Staff, by correspondent Dmitriy Kirilenko; place and date not given—recorded; from the "Topical Interview" program]

[Text] [Kirilenko] Hello, esteemed viewers. Our interlocutor today will be Colonel General Bronislav Aleksandrovich Omelichev, first deputy chief of the USSR Armed Forces General Staff.

Bronislav Aleksandrovich, the latest is that this spring call-up was somewhat changed in form. How was it changed?

[Omelichev] I will start by saying that indeed this year the basis for the call-up of young men to serve in the USSR Armed Forces is a decision for the Council of Ministers. That decision was issued on 29 March of this year. Previously, the fundamental document for the call-up of young men for service in the Armed Forces was an order by the minister of defense. Why such changes? First, these changes have taken place because the border troops, the interior troops, and the railway troops have been removed from the body of the Armed Forces. The reality had to correspond to that law-making act. There were also other reasons for this, for elevating the status of the document that defines the schedule and the procedure for calling up young men for the Armed Forces.

[Kirilenko] Was there a need for this?

[Omelichev] Yes, such a need existed, in my view. Why? Recently, certain bodies of local authority, in contravention of Soviet law about the universal military service obligation, have ceased to consider participation, personal participation in this state work to be a very important duty for themselves.

[Kirilenko] You say certain bodies. What bodies in particular?

[Omelichev] I mean, first and foremost, the regions [regiony] of the Baltic area, of all three republics there. I mean the regions of certain oblasts in the Ukraine, Transcaucasia, and Moldavia. At times... um, one often hears such a rejoinder: Military call-up offices exist—let them deal with this call-up work. But military call-up offices, which have only three, four, or five staff officers,

simply do not have the capacity by themselves to deal with the range, the large range of all the issues connected with the call-up. In recent times the situation has deteriorated, particularly with the call-up to the ranks of the Soviet Army and Navy in the Baltic republics. Certain leaders of those republics, the Sajudis leadership and the Popular Fronts' leadership, are attempting to turn the matter of the call-up for service into a bargaining chip with Moscow. For example, Prunskiene, chairman of the Lithuanian Council of Ministers, in a conversation with the republic's military commissar, indicated directly that only the start of talks with Moscow can provide a guarantee of a spring call-up this year. The chairman of the Estonian SSR's [Soviet Socialist Republic] Supreme Soviet stated at the session of his republic's Supreme Soviet that generally there would be no call-up of citizens in Estonia to the Soviet Army in the spring of 1990. A draft declaration has been prepared at the Latvian SSR's Supreme Soviet about the secession of the republic from the USSR, a draft declaration that will be presented at its first session to take place from 3 to 5 May. Here today, in the spirit of that declaration, decisions are already being made in the localities, concerning the impossibility of Letts [people closely related to Lithuanians, primarily inhabiting Latvia] serving in the Soviet Army. Concerning this, the anti-Army propaganda of informal organizations has been intensified, particularly propaganda by those operating in all three Baltic republics, such as Geneva-49, the League of Women, or the new Latvian organisation Fiery Cross. All these organizations are inciting young people to refuse serving in the army—to desertion.

[Kirilenko] In recent times, alarming news reports have been coming in, as you said, from the other republics. Tell me, please, in detail, what is happening there.

[Omelichev] Yes, attempts at evasion of military service are also taking place in other regions of the Soviet Union. For example, the so-called Union of Independence of the Ukrainian Youth, or SNUM [Soyuz Nezavisimosti Ukrainskoy Molodezhi], has been most active at Lvov in the Ukrainian national army, for the creation of a ministry of protection of the Ukraine, for the withdrawal of the occupier-troops—this is what they call the Soviet Union's Armed Forces—and for a refusal to serve in the latter.

[Kirilenko] They are now also calling us occupying troops in the Ukraine?

[Omelichev] I can tell you and I can tell all the viewers today that, specifically, in Lvov, the Armed Forces are called an occupation army at the mob meetings [Shabashi] the SNUM organization conducts. Calls are made on young men to refuse to do military service. Protection is promised, just as protection is promised by the Baltic Geneva-49 organization, to all those who refuse to do service in the Armed Forces and who hand in their call-up certificates.

There are also issues and difficulties concerning the organization of the call-up of young men for service in the Armed Forces in Moldavia. In Kishinev, the informal organization National Guard calls upon the young men of Moldavia to declare their disinclination to serve in the Soviet Army.

The Social-Democratic Army of Georgia advances the same slogans. Very many negative anti-Army utterances and questions connected with sabotaging the call-up and with not sending young people for army service take place in Armenia and in Azerbaijan. Here one must note the fact that the coordinated nature is evident of the anti-Army actions and of the attempts to sabotage the call-up by informal organizations in all the regions I have mentioned above. Let us bluntly state the very same methods are being used. First and foremost, they are lies and blackmail and intimidation—the intimidation of not only the young men but also of their parents. Attempts at physical violence take place against those who do not submit to provocations and also against the personnel of military call-up offices.

[Kirilenko] When talking about the Baltic area, you mentioned the organization known as Geneva-49. Please comment on that name, and generally on the entire ctivity in which that organization is engaged.

[Omelichev] I regard that question as very timely and legitimate. There has been a discussion going on for some time on this subject in the Baltic region, and indeed in a number of other parts of the country. There have been very many such discussions. So what lies behind this? On 12 August 1949 four Geneva conventions concerning protecting the victims of war were adopted. One of them, the Convention on the Protection of Civilians in Wartime, contains an Article 51. It forbids an occupying power from forcing the population of occupied territory to serve in its armed forces. The rules of the Geneva Conventions are applied to interstate juridical relations connected exclusively with military or armed... sorry, with war or with armed conflict. It follows, therefore, that these conventions have no bearing whatsoever on the juridical regulation of call-up of citizens for active military service directly here in the Soviet Union. To refer to them is nothing more than speculation on some of our people's lack of proper information. This is what is being done by those who cite the fine-sounding phrase Geneva-49 as a cover for doing their utmost to undermine the call-up to the armed forces and stop young men from being sent for service in the Soviet Army or Navy.

It can be noted today that the call-up is proceeding in a well- organized manner in oblasts such as Voronezh and Lipetsk, in Khabarovsk and Stavropol krays, in many oblasts of Ukraine, Belorussia, Kazakhstan, Uzbekistan, Turkmenia and other republics. This results from the fact that the problems of the call-up, the problems of preparing young men for army service, are accorded great importance here by the local administrative and party bodies and the Komsomol and veterans' organizations.

I should like to take this opportunity to appeal once more to all young men who are due for call-up this year to the Soviet Army and Navy—and to their parents—to carry out in a sacred way their constitutional duty for the defense of our socialist homeland, not to make the mistake of declining to serve in the ranks of the armed forces, and to remember this is a criminal act. We say today that defense of the homeland is a matter for the people; this means that call-up to the armed forces demands everyone's attention and concern.

Defense Chief Denies Spring Draft Postponed

LD0405211390 Moscow Television Service in Russian 2020 GMT 4 May 90

[From the "Television News Service" program]

[Text] KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA decided to please those awaiting conscription today. Under the headline "Reinforcements are held up" it announces that "by decision of the USSR Council of Minsters the spring draft has been postponed one month." The Ministry of Defense, however, greeted this news in amazement:

[G.F. Krivosheyev, deputy chief of the General Staff of the USSR Armed Forces, identified by caption] I have to say with the fullest sense of responsibility that the government act indicated in the article does not, in fact, exist. On the contrary, on 29 March the year, under the USSR Law on Universal Military Service, the USSR Council of Ministers adopted a decision on the demobilization from the ranks of the armed services, border, internal, and railway troops, of those servicemen who have served the prescribed term of active military service and on the routine call-up of citizens for active military service in April-June of this year. Thus, no matter what led to the publication in KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA, the spring draft will be held. Yes, of course, the spring draft is proceeding according to schedule.

Military Official Cited on Army Spring Call-Up

LD0405191790 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1330 GMT 4 May 90

[Interview with Colonel General Ivan Vasiliyevich Matveyev, chief of General Staff and administration head, by unidentified correspondent; place and date not given—recorded]

[Text] The matter to which we want to draw your attention will undoubtedly interest all those who have to get ready to join the army. Yes, it's spring, but spring is the time of call-up into the army. Year in, year out, the military commissariats carried it out precisely, in a set period, just like a clock. But today, a lot of people have phoned in to the editorial office to find out if it is true that this year the call-up has been postponed for a month. Our correspondent phoned up Colonel General Ivan Vasiliyevich Matveyev, a chief of General Staff, an administration head.

[Begin recording] [unidentified correspondent] Ivan Vasiliyevich, how true is this and to what extent is this rumor well founded?

[Matveyev] This is not a rumor, but today KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA published an article "The Reinforcements Are Held Up." There is a subheading "By Decision of the USSR Council of Ministers the Spring Draft is Postponed for a Month." First of all, it must be said that the government has not made such a decision, nor could it. On the contrary, on 29 March a decision by the USSR Council of Ministers was adopted on the transfer from the ranks of the USSR Armed Forces to the reserve of border, internal, and railway troops, and servicemen who have served the prescribed terms of active military service and on the routine call-up of citizens for active military service in April-June 1990. In order to implement the USSR law on general liability to military service and the above-mentioned decision, since 2 April the commissions for conscripting citizens for active military service have started operating.

It is another matter that owing to the lack of competence in these issues, the author of the article erroneously mixed up the call-up with the dispatching of the troops that have already been conscripted, which should start in the second half of May this year.

[Correspondent] How is the call-up going? Is it in anyway different from what it used to be like before?

[Mayveyev] In the main, the call-up is progressing just as it did formerly in the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic], the Ukraine, and Belorussia. The call-up is going slightly worse in the Baltic republics, especially throughout Lithuania, and in Transcaucasia, especially in the Georgian SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic]. Throughout the remaining regions of the country the call-up is progressing normally.

[Correspondent] At its session the Supreme Soviet of Armenia discussed the issue of not conscripting Armenian youths into the army in order to leave them in the republic and they would be able to eliminate the consequences of the earthquake.

[Mayveyev] First of all one must note that the decision of the Supreme Soviet of the Armenian SSR is fundamentally in contradiction to the Constitution. The Soviet Union draws manpower into its Armed Forces according to an exterritorial principle, according to which the conscripts will serve not only in their own parts, but on the distant border areas, of the North and the East, at individual border points in the USSR, on the large areas of water of the seas and oceans. Last year a decision was adopted by the Ministry of Defense that the majority of conscripts should be dispatched to the disaster area. However, experience, last year's experience, demonstrated that the military discipline was very bad, absence without leave was taken systematically because they were near home. They worked very poorly. It is therefore difficult to meet them halfway, but the main thing is that the law provides for the acquisiton of manpower on an exterritorial principle. [end recording]

Baltic Republics

Baltic States To Hold High-Level Consultations

LD0605094690 Vilnius International Service in Lithuanian 2100 GMT 5 May 90

[Text] Consultations at the highst level between Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia will take place in the very near future, Supreme Council Chairman Vytautas Landsbergis stated at a press conference today.

This is prompted by recent events in Latvia which, in the words of Vytautas Landsbergis, may only strengthen the position of Baltic states. As reported by us earlier, last night, a declaration of restoration of the Latvian Republic's independence was adopted by the Latvian Supreme Soviet. According to reviewers, it is somewhat less radical than that of Lithuania. However, it is more radical than the path chosen by Estonia.

On this occasion, Vytautas Landsbergis sent a telegram of congratulations yesterday, addressed to the Latvian parliament. Unfortunately, it was announced by Latvia this evening that USSR President Mikhail Gorbachev has issued a demand to the Latvian Supreme Soviet to retract the adopted resolutions, or else face economic sanctions.

Yakovlev Urges Moscow-Lithuanian Dialogue

LD0605095590 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0643 GMT 6 May 90

[Text] Moscow time is 1043. We are continuing the Mayak Sunday musical-information program "Panorama." The next subject of our "Panorama" could perhaps be headed "The Personal Opinion of a Personality." This, in essence, is the motto of the club of the INTERFAX information agency. And the subject will be the meeting between Aleksandr Nikolayevich Yakovlev and journalists which recently took place in this club.

The club has been envisaged by its founders as a place of unofficial, informal meetings with eminent political and public figures of the Soviet Union; meetings at which these well-known people can express their private opinions, not just the official ones to which their lofty posts oblige them, regarding the restructuring process in our country.

Aleksandr Nikolayevich Yakovlev was asked a lot of questions, and in today's "Panorama" we shall be returning to the meeting at the INTERFAX Club, which I attended along with other journalists. For the moment, here is Aleksandr Nikolayevich's reply to a question dealing with the situation surrounding Lithuania.

[Begin Yakovlev recording] You will know that under the Soviet Constitution, every republic has the right to its own self-determination, up to and including secession. But any decision of this sort, affecting as it does the future of a given people, the future of all the people who live in a given republic, and the future of the peoples of the other republics and the whole of the Union, economic, political, social, and cultural interests, requires that matters of this sort be addressed by constitutional means, on the basis of dialogue, consultation, referenda, and all the democratic procedures that are in fact generally accepted in the civilized world.

After all, the issue at stake with Lithuania is not to keep a particular republic within the Soviet Union by force. The issue is that all this must proceed on the basis of the law. The Lithuanian leaders are now saying that they are ready for dialogue, discussion, and so on and so forth. But the whole point is that these negotiations cannot commence when everything has already been decided, with the Lithuanian comrades having decided first to declare independence—which should come at the end of the talks—first to declare it, and then to offer talks. That is not the way things are done. It's absurd! The present Lithuanian leadership's argument is that they do not recognize Lithuania's joining the USSR. It is they who do not recognize it. But 50 years have elapsed since then. There was a war. There has been the postwar setup. There have been the Helsinki agreements. Finally, there has been the nationwide adoption of the Constitution, in which all the republics are designated. In general there are realities we just cannot evade. There are the established economic, political and cultural links between all republics.

No one is refusing to sit down and discuss all the matters that may arise, that may arise on the part of an individual republic or the center. But this must be discussed in a civilized, normal way. [end recording]

Soviet Army Rehearses for Parade in Vilnius

AU0505151890 Paris AFP in English 1420 GMT 5 May 90

[Text] Vilnius, May 5 (AFP)—Lithuanian leader Vytautas Landsbergis expressed regret Saturday that the Soviet Army had failed to notify Lithuanian authorities about plans for a midnight rehearsal of the May 9 World War II victory parade. Mr. Landsbergis told a news conference here that the authorities should have been told in advance of plans to deploy several hundred soldiers with armoured vehicles and tanks between midnight Friday and 02:00 am along the parade route through Vilnius.

About 30 troop carriers, guns, seven medium-range missiles and their launchers and scores of lorries trundled through the city overnight, stopping for a long time outside parliament, the symbol of Lithuania's bid for independence.

The Lithuanian Information Center in New York said a column of 25 Soviet light-armoured tanks, the missile launchers and army trucks halted outside the Lithuanian parliament for several hours. At about the same time, between 200 and 300 Soviet soldiers, armed and in dress uniforms and combat fatigues, marched from barracks to the city centre.

Vilnius inhabitants ignored the show of force, the latest of several by Soviet forces since the March 11 declaration of independence by the Baltic republic.

Possible Resumption of Gas Supplies Reported

LD0505101190 Vilnius Domestic Service in Lithuanian 2100 GMT 4 May 90

[Excerpts] Roma Pakeniene's blockade diary: Today a message arrived in Vilnius from Moscow that the supply of liquified gas to Lithuania is going to be resumed. This gas ceased to come to Lithuania since 27 April. The USSR minister of communications has informed Vice Premier Algirdas Brazauskas that this happened because the railwaymen have been forbidden to transport gas cisterns.

In Lithuania liquified gas is used mostly by the residents, especially in the countryside. In all, there are some 600,000 apartments in Lithuania using liquified gas for cooking. When it was operating, the Mazeikiai oil refinery produced about 85 percent of the liquified gas used in Lithuania. Only 15 percent was supplied by the Soviet Union. When the Mazeikiai oil refinery ceased production and the delivery of gas stopped from the Union, there was a great shortage. Therefore, the sale of this gas to residents was very limited. The quantity of gas economized this way would be sufficient for the next 10 days. All rural inhabitants have been warned that from tomorrow they will not be supplied with liquified gas. [passage omitted]

Thus the Union department has promised to supply Lithuania with all the gas it requires. Usually Lithuania uses about 130,000 tonnes per year. Tomorrow the first 10 cisterns of liquified gas will leave Leningrad Oblast for Lithuania and will reach the republic in one or two days. Other trainloads with gas will arrive in Lithuania in roughly 10-15 days, because they are being sent from Tataria, Bashkiria, Ufa, and other remote places in Russia, that is, some 2-3,000 kilometres. Thus in the near future Lithuania's residents will be fully supplied with liquified gas.

According to unofficial information, permission to supply Lithuania with liquified gas was given by Soviet Government leader Nikolay Ryzhkov.

Meanwhile, the supply of natural gas to the Azotas association in Jonava has not yet been solved. We already reported that last Wednesday the Lithuanian government sent a message to the Soviet Government assuring that all additionally received natural gas would be supplied to the Azotas association. However, it seems that the Kremlin is not very concerned that the Union's furniture industry will stop its production shortly. The Jonava enterprise was the main supplier of resins to the Soviet Union's entire furniture industry. According to Algirdas Brazauskas, the Soviet Union Council of Ministers examined this problem, but no decision has been made and the Lithuanian government so far has not received any reply. [passage omitted] The Jonava enterprise's leaders expect to receive better news next Monday when heads of the corresponding Moscow department, who are favorably inclined toward us, will once more try to exert pressure on the Union's Government.

And today, on the 16th day of the blockade, work at Lithuania's enterprises is comparatively normal. About 10 percent of them do not manufacture their main products. [passage omitted]

Vilnius Radio Carries 4 May Supreme Council

Moscow Delegation Debated

LD0405110290

[Editorial Report] Vilnius Domestic Service in Lithuania at 1002 GMT on 4 May broadcasts an announcement during a news bulletin that a debate on the political situation is under way at the session of the Supreme Council of the Republic of Lithuania in Vilnius and that Supreme Council deputies have decided that it should be broadcast. The radio then begins a live relay from the Supreme Council hall and Deputy Romas Gudaitis is heard speaking. He says that a special declaration on independence should be made addressed to Moscow and a delegation should be sent there.

At 1012 GMT Albertas Simenas urges the parliamentary leadership to draw up concrete plans for future negotiations with Moscow, and calls for direct relations to be established with various enterprises in the Soviet Union to overcome the blockade.

At 1020 GMT Deputy Vidmantas Ziemelis says that a proposal for Landsbergis to go uninvited to Moscow should not be supported. In his opinion, Moscow cannot be trusted in view of its behavior in Afghanistan, after the Chernobyl accident, and now the economic blockade of Lithuania. Nobody knows who will be in power in Moscow when the time for negotiations with the Soviet Union will come, he says. Ziemelis objects to the proposed postponement or freezing of some laws passed by the Supreme Council. Lithuania can sit at the negotiating table only when Moscow acknowledges the compulsory incorporation of Lithuania into the Soviet Union.

At 1030 GMT the session adjourns until 1100 GMT.

Antiblockade Efforts Viewed

LD0405134690

[Editorial Report] Vilnius Domestic Service in Lithuanian at 1100 GMT on 4 May resumes its live relay from the Lithuanian Supreme Council as it resumes its session in Vilnius. The session is introduced by its chairman, deputy Abisalas. Next to speak is Deputy Stasys Malkevicius. He says that to overcome the blockade, supplies to the Soviet Union should be equal to those coming from the Soviet Union. Meanwhile, Lithuania is still fulfilling its obligations in the delivery of various products to the

Soviet Union. The government should take resolute steps in this respect and take an offensive part in this economic war with Moscow, he says. Everyone must take an active part in this war without waiting for orders from above.

At 1109 GMT Algirdas Brazauskas takes the floor. He discusses the effect of the economic blockade.

At 1131 GMT questions are put to Brazauskas about various aspects of the blockade.

At 1135 GMT Deputy Abisalas who is in the chair asked the deputies to limit their questions, because otherwise the debates will become an investigation of the work of the antiblockade commission.

At 1141 GMT Deputy Vytautas Pleckaitis takes the floor stating that there are people who are afraid of losing their posts and consequently incite citizens against the government and parliament. He proposes that during the blockade shorter working hours or shorter working weeks should be introduced. The deputies should maintain closer relations with the electors. He notes that he visited Poland recently and established that the Poles were very disappointed with the attitude of Western countries. The Poles urged Lithuania to believe only in its own strength and efforts.

At 1146 GMT Deputy Kazimieras Antanavicius stresses that the duty of the Supreme Council is to solve strategic problems. Parliament must support the government and prevent attempts to split Lithuanian society. The only way to maintain the republic's economy on a high level, he says, is the establishment of good relations with Lithuania's neighbors in the East. He continues dealing with various aspects of activities, including even the construction of garages. In conclusion he apologizes for his long speech.

At 1207 GMT an unnamed deputy objects to such a long speech by the previous speaker.

At 1211 GMT Deputy Jokubas Minkevicius takes the floor stating that the problem of Lithuania's independence is to be decided by Lithuania and it is only Lithuania's problem. He speaks about spiritual values and the lack of secondary education by some people.

At 1230 GMT Minkevicius is reminded that his statement was too long.

At 1231 GMT deputy Abisalas states that ten more deputies intend to speak.

At 1132 GMT an interval is announced.

Political Situation Debated

LD0405154590

[Editorial Report] Vilnius Domestic Service in Lithuanian at 1300 GMT on 4 May continues its live relay from the Lithuanian Supreme Council as it resumes its sessions in Vilnius. Deputy Povilas Varanauskas starts the debate on the political situation, and is followed by Aleksandras Abisalas and Albinas Januska.

At 1408 GMT Vytautas Landsbergis, chairman of the Supreme Council, makes a statement on the political situation. As far as his remarks can be heard, he speaks about the USSR leadership's demand that Lithuania return to the situation before 11 March, and reaffirms that this demand cannot be met as the issue of independence is not negotiable. He describes his visit to Latvia and the independence declaration which is likely to be adopted there. He also alludes to the economic blockade.

At 1445 GMT the live relay from the Supreme Council session is discontinued.

Brazauskas Discusses Effects of Blockade

LD0405145490 Vilnius Domestic Service in Lithuanian 1109 GMT 4 May 90

[Statement by Algirdas Brazauskas, deputy chairman of the Council of Ministers of Lithuania, at the Supreme Council session in Vilnius—live]

[Excerpts] Esteemed deputies, in the first days of the [Lithuanian] republic's blockade a republican government commission was set up, called the commission to coordinate the problems of supplying the republic's economy with fuel and other power resources. [passage omitted] The commission is meeting once or twice per day. At the same time a commission has been set up chaired by the prime minister, esteemed [Kazimiera] Prunskiene. [passage omitted]

The blockade has been going on for 16 days. Yesterday and today we felt that it is not declining, but in some aspects becoming more difficult. I would like to divide these problems into three groups: fuel and power problems which are being constantly solved by this commission, those resources which are at our disposal, and those which we succeeded in obtaining and which we attempt to use in the most rational way during this period of time, with the smallest possible losses to Lithuania life. [passage omitted]

Statements have already been made here that our power resources will end by 20 May. This is a sad fact, but we say this today, hoping for substantial aid from outside. I must confess that I expect very little help from the Soviet Union. I do not imagine any help from there. Our efforts to maintain contacts with Tyumen, Belorussia, and other partners who could solve these problems are thwarted by a strict decision on the railway blockade. Although we are able to obtain gasoline, diesel oil, or other oil products, we cannot transport them to Lithuania. [passage omitted]

I would like to dwell on the next question, that is, our contacts with the Soviet Union as a whole, and with its individual areas. There are instances, I cannot deny this, in which our products are being sent beyond the borders of our republic. Our products which have not been

delivered amount to some R13 million. About 54 [of the] largest enterprises are not fulfilling their obligations. I have a list of such strategic products which we are not supplying to the Soviet Union. This includes furniture, cement—about 300,000 tonnes, all plastic products, cables, compressors, washing machines, welding equipment, artificial fiber products, wire, scrap metal, paper, kinescopes, and many other products. [passage omitted]

But I wish to draw your attention to the fact that there is a long list of enterprises which do not adhere to this order and, the border being open, the products of some enterprises are being taken away. Therefore, I would like to stress and propose to the government commission very seriously to consider the work of the directors of some Union enterprises. This should be done on Monday [7 May], as it is envisaged at a meeting of that commission. [passage omitted]

The problem of horizontal relations is being widely publicized. This is one method we could use to achieve a great deal, even in the conditions of the blockade. [passage omitted]. These relations are increasing. [passage omitted] Hundreds of people from our republican departments and individual enterprises travel in the Union looking for these direct connections. And this method of cooperation yields good results. [passage omitted]

We have a list of Union regions that do not support us and of those that do. [passage omitted] There are horizontal relations with some towns, individual oblasts, and republics.

The next very acute problem is that of food products. A group of people from the Ministry of Agriculture and the Ministry of Food Industry have gone to Moscow. Talks are taking place on how to solve this important problem of supplying us with essential food products. You see the state of affairs in the shops in Lithuania. We had to start rationing the most elementary food products because their stocks are very limited.

And now, about meat which has not been delivered. [passage omitted] I have to tell you that during these 16 days we have significantly delayed the delivery of meat products. Here are the figures: 300 tonnes of sausages, 3,000 tonnes of meat only during those 16 days, large quantities of confectionery goods, 2,500,000 conventional canned food products, tobacco products, etc. [passage omitted]. However, we cannot avoid the established links that supply Moscow and Leningrad with fresh meat. We place great hopes on Moscow and Leningrad. A delegation from Vilnius has already been to Moscow. Today, such a delegation is in Leningrad. We are very interested in obtaining other vitally essential products in these cities. And we are getting these products. [passage omitted]

Another problem for us is the production of combined fodder and the supply of grain. We consume 25 tonnes of imported wheat per month. We have our own rye. Groats are imported, and barley for malt is imported from Western Europe. Today, stocks of combined fodder for our large complexes are sufficient for only two weeks. There is a proposal to reduce the number of pigs and thus solve this problem. But we must not forget that we have large complexes for the production of eggs. Three million eggs are consumed per day in Lithuania. [passage omitted] Food products are strategic products. They mean more than construction, steel, timber or anything else. [passage omitted] In three days this month, the consumption of butter tripled. [passage omitted] The supply of meat must be increased because we must compensate for a very bad vegetable oil situation. [passage omitted] No matter how long the blockade will last, we must feed people. [passage omitted]

I wish to say that there are many people in the Soviet Union and other republics who are assuming deputies' duties, people in local government, who have a very favorable attitude toward us and toward Lithuania, and we must develop and maintain relations with them. I do not see any other way out today. [passage omitted] I wish to state that Belorussia, our neighbor, has expressed a positive wish to improve our cooperation. I have agreed with its new leaders that I am going to Minsk tomorrow, where we will try to establish contacts on how to ease our lot, especially in view of the fact that Belorussia processes 40 million tonnes of oil in its two enterprises. Possibly, we will be able to agree with them at least to supply the border areas with their products. So much for information today.

More on Blockade

LD0405101790 Vilnius International Service in Lithuanian 2100 GMT 3 May 90

["Blockade Diary" program by Rima Jakutyte]

[Excerpts] Today is the 15th day of the economic blockade. [passage omitted]

Of course, the Lithuanian government will attempt to purchase oil abroad and transport it via Klaipeda port, but the problems with regard to its acceptance, transportation to Mazeikiai, and processing at the Mazeikiai enterprise have not been solved. According to the chief engineer at the Mazeikiai refinery, Albertas Gimbutas, although attempts are being made to reconstruct this enterprise, so far there is no real solution in Lithuania, and Gimbutas does not expect that it will be found in the near future. The port of Klaipeda and the railways are not adapted even for the minimum supplies to the enterprise. To put into operation at least one technological line at the Mazeikai refinery, at least 15,000 to 16,000 tonnes of oil per 24 hours are needed. This means six trainloads. Bearing in mind that such a quantity of oil should be transferred from ships to the reservoir, then to railway cisterns, then transported to Mazeikiai, and from here transferred once again from the cisterns, stated the engineer, he does not see any logical or practical solution of this problem. According to him, the only practical way for the enterprise to obtain raw materials is through the USSR pipeline directly to Mazeikiai.

An interview with the enterprise's general director, Bronislovas Vainora, published in the daily RESPUBLIKA today, is not much more optimistic either. According to him, the enterprise is not able to unload the quantity of oil essential for the enterprise's work. Special equipment is needed, and its plans are still being drawn up. Although the necessary equipment could be produced at the compressor factory in Mazeikiai, the enterprise does not know yet whether Lithuania will be able to obtain oil abroad. [passage omitted] By the way, the director mentioned an interesting detail: a proposal has been submitted to the USSR Ministry of Oil Industry to resume the supply of oil to Mazeikiai under the condition that all processed oil products would go to the USSR. But the director is afraid that this idea could be misunderstood in Lithuania and its initiators regarded as traitors of the nation.

What would Lithuania gain from this idea acceptable to both sides? First, the unemployment problem at the enterprise would be solved. [passage omitted] In the opinion of the director, in view of the poor management in the USSR, not a small part of gasoline and other oil products would remain in Lithuania. [passage omitted]

We have already reported that all four sugar refineries have ceased to operate after failing to receive imported raw materials from Cuba. The Panevezys Ekranas factory, supplying kinescopes to some USSR television enterprises, has sufficient quantities of raw materials to last up to 20 May. One of the four lines will be stopped next week. The Panevezys factory of precision mechanics will continue its work this month. [passage omitted]

A different situation exists at the Siauliai meat combine. The enterprise is working at full capacity. By supplying meat, the Siauliai combine recently received in exchange from Leningrad essential packaging materials, equipment, and petrol. A paradoxical situation exists in Siauliai: while other enterprises are halting production and people are unemployed, the meat combine is short of labor. This state of affairs is due to the fact that agricultural workers, knowing that this year they will obtain smaller quantities of concentrated fodder, are reducing the number of their livestock. [passage omitted]

Number of Lithuanian Unemployed Remains Stable

LD0605121190 Vilnius International Service in Lithuanian 2100 GMT 5 May 90

[Excerpts] Today marks the 17th day of Lithuania's blockade. Deputy Gediminas Vagnorius, member of the government Antiblockade Commission, told journalists: The situation in Lithuania is not critical. [passage omitted] The number of unemployed remains stabilized at 12,500. This comprises those idled by industry, transportation, and construction. The majority of this number, however, have already been provided other work. Some 5,000 of that number are employed in agriculture, and 7,500 are employed by those industrial enterprises that are experiencing manpower shortages.

This commission will hold a meeting on Monday to discuss four principal questions: Whether to limit the export of food products from Lithuania; how to balance the export and import of goods; whether to increase the price of gasoline and other fuels; and how to rapidly prepare for crude oil deliveries to the port of Klaipeda, and the processing of this oil in Mazeikiai.

I will explain the possible increases in gasoline prices, since there have been some even earlier proposals, suggesting gasoline imports from neighboring republics and its sale at commercial prices. Should the government commission decide to go ahead with this, gasoline prices in Lithuania will see a four-fold increase above those in state trade.

Blockade Leads To Shortened Broadcast Day

LD0605145990 Vilnius Domestic Service in Russian 1200 GMT 6 May 90

[Summary] The economic blockade of Lithuania has meant that to save electricity the second program of Lithuanian radio has been cut by one hour beginning 24 April. It now ends at midnight [2100 GMT], instead of 0100 [2200 GMT]. All transmitters carrying the second program on medium wave and UHF are switched off at midnight and switched back on at 0700 [0400 GMT], when the second program starts up again. Previously, they were switched on at 0600 [0300 GMT] and carried the first program of Lithuanian radio for the first hour.

UHF transmitters relaying Moscow's second program on Lithuanian territory also have had their operating time cut. While previously they worked around the clock, now they are switched off from midnight to 0600.

Regarding television broadcasts, beginning 24 April, the morning program of Lithuanian television is relayed only on working days from 0745 to 0815 [0445- 0515 GMT]. In other words, just the "Good Morning" program is broadcast. As before, evening broadcasting begins at 1800 [1500 GMT]. As before, too, the television schedule is relayed in full on weekends and holidays.

USSR Central Television's extended nighttime program is no longer relayed in Lithuania. The transmitters are switched off immediately after the news bulletin. On workdays, the second program of Central Television is relayed only from 1730 [1430 GMT] to the end of its broadcasts.

As before, the trial relay of the first program of Polish television on Channel 37 begins at 1815 [1515 GMT] on workdays, and at 1000 [0700 GMT] on weekends. It continues its relay until the end of programing.

In Kaunas, instead of the first program of Soviet Central Television, as of the end of April, Channel Seven will carry the West German satellite program "Drei-Sat" in German. Meanwhile, Central Television will continue to be available on Channel 28.

Lithuania's Economic Problems, Measures Detailed

LD0405183890 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1400 GMT 4 May 90

[Text] [Announcer] Naturally, our attention and that of our listeners continues to be riveted on Lithuania, which it seems, is increasingly being drawn into the maelstrom of high politics. This is demonstrated by reports from abroad and from the republic itself. Let us see what the latest news from Lithuania is. Here is our correspondent, Elena Kurklityte, live from Vilnius. Elena, good evening.

[Kurklityte] Good evening. Yes, Lithuania already finds itself in the sphere of high politics. This was shown by the unofficial meeting between Kazimiera Prunskiene, prime minister of the Lithuanian Republic, and U.S. President George Bush. There are no further details as yet of the content of their 45-minute conversation, but it is already known in the republic that the economic blockade was one of the subjects discussed. I would therefore like in today's report to dwell in greater detail on this topic, and to take a look at the problem from the inside, so to speak.

[Announcer] The blockade is into its 15th day. Are the losses being incurred by the Lithuanian national economy known?

[Kurklityte] There are vast losses. The Department of Statistics has presented the government of the republic with a statistical report on losses for the period 16-28 April. These are the initial losses of the blockade. It is calculated that because of the shortage of power and material resources the Lithuanian economy sustained losses amounting to R15.5 million during this period. In the view of the government commission, this is far from being all of the damage: the figure reflects only the amount of output that failed to be produced in this period. The damage to the Lithuanian budget and indirect losses which, because of unmanufactured output, are affecting other branches of Lithuania's industry and the country as a whole have not yet been worked out.

At today's session, several deputies of the Lithuanian Supreme Soviet proposed that countermeasures be adopted, that deliveries of many items, mostly to include meat and dairy products, should be halted to the country. The reply of Deputy Algirdas Brazauskas, chairman of the antiblockade commission of the Council of Ministers, was that this would be improper, because there are republics and individual oblasts and towns within the country which are not refusing to supply raw and processed materials to Lithuania by direct link. Many enterprises have stopped or are in the process of stopping because of a shortage of raw materials, and that includes all four of the republic's sugar refineries.

[Announcer] Yes, it is not a pretty picture, is it? But many people must have been laid off work. How will they live?

[Kurklityte] The Supreme Soviet Presidium has passed the provisions of a Lithuanian state and public blockade fund. The fund will be used to assist permanent residents of Lithuania who, because of the economic blockade, have partly or fully lost their income, and as a result have found themselves—together with their families—in a difficult material position, in addition to those who are poorly-off or who have large families, as well as single people and invalids whose earnings, because of the consequences of the blockade, are not enough to meet their minimum needs.

[Announcer] Who is making contributions? Has a certain amount already been collected?

[Kurklityte] Yes, the fund consists of contributions from the public, from enterprises, institutions, and [public] movements in the Lithuanian Republic and other states. As reported by Zhilsotsbank in Vilnius, the fund already has more than R1 million. A large sum of money—R3,000—was contributed by Trushin from Moscow. His cash transfer included the following words: Accept my aid for the Lithuanian people. There are also other transfers from Moscow, Leningrad, Alma-Ata, Bryansk, and Kaliningrad oblast. Money is being sent by people of different ages, professions, and nationalities. As far as the newspaper headlines are concerned, I will tell you just some of them to give our listeners an idea of what life in Lithuania is like at the moment. Here are some newspaper headlines, for instance: "Partners Assist in a Time of Trouble"; "Let Us Remember That the Bicycle Is Our Best Friend"; "Carts Instead of Cars"; "Musicians Aid Blockade Appeal"; "Search for Spiritual Accord"; and here is one last headline, "While We Have Valerian Drops, Life Is Continuing".

[Announcer] It is good that people have kept their sense of humor! But what is the psychological situation in Lithuania? How is the public reacting to unemployment and all the shortages?

[Kurklityte] I cannot speak for everyone, because as a result of the shortage of power, fuel, and material resources around 12,000 people have been laid off in the republic. That is not counting the people who have gone on collective leave. But people are not particularly upset. And, as IZVESTIYA notes today, people in Lithuania have not lost their good spirits and sense of optimism. I would add from my own observations that people have become more polite and responsive to others. People are less rude in the crowded buses, and they are making more jokes. On radio and television, there is an increasing amount of advice on how to save gas and electricity, and how to cook particular dishes given the rationing that the populace is subject to—just two kg of flour and two kg of cereals are allowed per person per month, and so on.

Many people have been worried by the threat that a number of papers would stop being published because of a shortage of newsprint. But yesterday at the Grigiskes Production Association, the first commercial batch of newsprint was produced. So now every scrap of paper is going to be collected for pulp, out of which newsprint will

be made. A decision has been taken to refit the oil berths at the port of Klaipeda. In midsummer Lithuania will be ready to receive foreign gasoline and oil by sea. Good-quality oil has been found at a depth of two km in Klaipedskiy Rayon. Plans for wind-power stations and solar power units for residential houses are also being discussed. In general, new possibilities are being sought and a think tank is in operation. So life really is carrying on.

[Announcer] Well, thank you for the details, Elena. We shall say goodbye to you.

Antiblockade Commission Issues Supply Proposals

LD0505095690 Vilnius Domestic Service in Lithuanian 2100 GMT 4 May 90

[Excerpt] [passage omitted] The government antiblockade commission has proposed that the government immediately increase the supply of meat and milk products to the residents of Lithuania. It also supported a proposal by the Lithuanian Bank and the Ministry of Finance to issue state bonds. People acquiring these bonds would support the realization of Lithuania's independence.

According to the information of the republican Statistical Department, yesterday there were 12,700 unemployed. Their number increased by 500 in one day.

Lithuanian Communique on Economic Situation

LD0505083190 Vilnius Domestic Service in Lithuanian 1900 GMT 4 May 90

["Communique by the Lithuanian government on the economic situation in the republic"]

[Text] In the last 24 hours, the stocks of fuel in the republic did not change. The government commission on the economic situation decided to distribute more economically gasoline and diesel oil for production transport so that these products last longer for transport, serving the most essential needs of the population.

By 7 May the Ministry of Economics and Power Engineering must submit concrete proposals on the expediency of allowing imported gasoline purchased at commercial prices into Lithuania and trading in it.

In order to maintain the vital capacity of Lithuania's economy affected by the blockade, it is very important to balance imports and exports so that the exchange does not hurt the republic. At present, the number of railcars transporting products manufactured by Lithuania's enterprises has declined by 56 percent since the beginning of the blockade. The Ministry of Material Resources, at the government's instruction, is coordinating the dispatch of products outside of Lithuania in accordance with centralized agreements, delivering required products to the republic. Some enterprises, including the Vilnius fuel equipment works, the Zalgiris machine tool works, the Neris agricultural machinery works, the Vilnius drill factory, and others dispatch their products without permission from the Ministry of Material Resources.

All these cases will be assessed at the next meeting of the government antiblockade commission.

Construction Concentrating on Housing, Social

LD0505134790 Vilnius Domestic Service in Russian 1200 GMT 5 May 90

[Text] A special commission is helping to solve problems of rural construction in the present difficult conditions. Following its proposal, it has been decided to temporarily postpone the construction of agricultural production facilities and to concentrate on the construction of housing and social facilities. And here is yet another example: some building organizations are working longer days in order to save fuel and lubricants. This means that in four days they have to fulfill five-day tasks. Strict regimes of economzing cement, metal constructions, and, especially timber, have been introduced on building sites.

Union Bank Halts Foreign Currency Transactions

LD0505083790 Vilnius Domestic Service in Lithuanian 2045 GMT 4 May 90

[Text] The Bank for Economic Relations With Foreign Countries of the Republic of Lithuania has received a message from the USSR Foreign Trade Bank requesting a halt to the issuance of currency to Lithuania's citizens on private travel abroad. We have decided not to comply with this instruction, stated Danute [last name indistinct], chairman of the bank board. Starting on 7 May we are going to change currency for people traveling to Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Mongolia, and Vietnam, because we have sufficient sums of those currencies. Since 1 October 1989 Moscow has not supplied our bank with convertible currency. Because of the political situation in the republic the number of tourists from the capitalist countries has declined very substantially and we are unable to change the currency of those countries for Lithuania's citizens.

We have sufficient convertible currency only to cover currency accounts of enterprises and organizations and private savings.

Similiar messages prohibiting the change of currency for Lithuania's citizens have been received by the foreign trade banks in Leningrad, Minsk, and other republics. Such instruction by the USSR Foreign Trade Bank can be regarded as yet another step in the economic blockade.

Deputy Says Western Support 'Not Decisive'

LD0505025390 Vilnius International Service in English 2130 GMT 4 May 90

[Text] The greater part of the Lithuanian parliamentary session today was devoted to political discussion.

According to Bronis Kuzmickas, deputy chairman of the Supreme Council, the political, economic, and social situation in Lithuania was acquiring certain signs of stability, while the constant confrontation with the Soviet leadership was the major obstacle in finding ways out of the situation. We do not know how the blockade is going to develop, Bronis Kuzmickas said and we are approaching the line beyond which there is total exhaustion of energy resources. He said he did not see guarantees against Lithuania's independence being squashed by external forces, as there were no guarantees that perestroyka in the USSR was an irreversible process. Bronis Kuzmickas noted that the economic blockade might be a prelude to genocide, like the one which Lithuania had experienced in postwar years.

As for the support of the West, he did not consider it to be of decisive importance. On the other hand, Lithuania will get support only when it clearly demonstrates that it is concerned not only about its independence but also about the democratic changes in East Europe and the peace and stability in this part of the world.

Later in the day MPs [members of parliament] had an exchange of views on how to ease the confrontation between Moscow and Vilnius and how to start a dialogue. There was a marked division of opinions in the parliament on this issue. MP Romas Gudaitis suggested establishing a period of the consolidation of independence, the duration of which would depend on the developments in the USSR. He also put forward the idea of accepting the status of confederational relations between Lithuania and the USSR. This latter move was strongly criticized by another MP, lawyer Vidmantas Ziemelis, who saw the 1920 Lithuanian-Soviet Russian Treaty as the only possible basis for establishing a new agreement.

He also objected to sending to Moscow a top level Lithuanian delegation headed by Vytautas Landsbergis, even if Mikhail Gorbachev had in advance categorically refused to receive it. The latter idea had been earlier put forward by MP Romas Gudaitis. Neither the moderates nor the hardliners had the upper hand in the debate today, but it is obvious that the hopes of the parliament are more directed to the East than to the West now. The Lithuanian Supreme Council will resume work next Tuesday.

Soviet Commander Concerned About Border Situation

LD0405155790 Warsaw Television Service in Polish 1515 GMT 4 May 90

[No video available]

[Text] The situation on the Polish-Lithuanian border is not easy, stated Colonel Vycheslav (?Yeschikov), commander of the Border Defense Troops of the Baltic Military District. Polish citizens of Lithuanian origin have many times declared their assistance for refugees from the Soviet Union. In recent months there has been large scale smuggling from Poland of Lithuanian independence literature. I fear a situation similar to that on the Soviet-Iranian border, where the Azerbaijani population demolished the border facilities, (?Yeschikov) concluded.

Landsbergis Sends Greetings to Latvia

LD0505110290 Vilnius Domestic Service in Lithuanian 0900 GMT 5 May 90

[Text] The chairman of the Supreme Council of the Republic of Lithuania, Vytautas Langsbergis, has sent greetings to the Supreme Soviet of Latvia. His message says:

We welcome with joy and ardently support the declaration of the Supreme Soviet of the Latvian Republic of 4 May 1990 on the restoration of Latvia's independence. We firmly believe that this decision will be a decisive historical step in the life of the Latvian people striving for freedom and democracy. We are determined, as hitherto, to advance together along the Baltic way and, in the name of the future, to bear together with you possible calamities and difficulties.
[Signed] The chairman of the Supreme Council of the Republic of Lithuania, Vytautas Landsbergis.

Lithuanian Trade Minister on U.S., Canada Talks

LD0705144190 Vilnius International Service in Lithuanian 0000 GMT 7 May 90

[Interview with Lithuanian Trade Minister Albertas Sinevicius by Presenter Roma Pakeniene; place not indicated; on 6 May—recorded]

[Excerpts] [Pakeniene] Now the promised interview with Lithuanian Trade Minister Albertas Sinevicius. He returned today from the United States, where he accompanied Lithuanian Prime Minister Kazimiera Prunskiene. We discussed politics briefly, talking mostly about economic matters. I will first refer to Albertas Sinevicius' words: Lithuania has accumulated very sizeable political capital. He also stated: Given some preconditions, discussions with leaders of other countries may follow the London meeting. [passage omitted]

[Sinevicius] We managed business affairs, so to speak, concretely in part, also including strategic questions and those what may be termed foraging questions and current demands. Purtulis just returned from Washington to Toronto to finalize those matters. [passage omitted]

We simply had to go there to hold discussions with various organizations, conglomerates, and bankers. We met with four or five major bank representatives in Toronto so that they would regard us not as a tiny state that goes about with an outstretched hand, but as someone who wishes to be considered an equal partner, not in [word indistnct] sense, as we cannot be equal partners to the United States or Canada, since we are small and our goods are not as competitive as we would like them to be on the world market. However, we still

would like to trade in those goods and products we produce, and we would like to make use of our well-placed geographical situation. We wish to continue trade, and do not visualize not trading with our Eastern neighbor. We have traded and will continue to trade and would like to be useful, so to speak, to the West in the future and to profit from it. As a middleman and partner, we may in some instances become useful [word indistinct]. [passage omitted]

We have such a [words indistinct] that we may be useful, to become, almost as if to say, European Hong Kong. Since, as I mentioned previously, we have a high measure of qualifications and the work force is relatively cheap, if we were to compare it with U.S. workers' salaries, we think we could initially provide conditions and prerequisites for our Lithunaian people to be employed and to receive markedly improved pay. Concurrently we will accumulate for ourselves, so to speak, some engineering and production potential for the future. [passage omitted]

We saw what a strong influence is exerted by Lithuanians. We are truly touched and extremely grateful for their assistance, without which we would have accomplished nothing. In such matters, one must have an intermediary respected by both sides, both this one and that one. We wish our Lithuania to be like that, entire between the East and the West, in economics and politics.

Report on Lithuanian 'Union of Riflemen' Group

LD0505220390 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1700 GMT 5 May 90

[Report by special correspondent S. Dorenko in Vilnius—from the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] Despite calls from deputies of the Lithuanian legislature to tell the people the truth about the economic situation in the republic and to immediately compromise with Moscow, the Lithuanian leadership repeated today that it's position has not changed. [video shows the Lithuanian Seimas in session and then Landsbergis and others at a news conference]

One of the forces supporting the intractability of the politicians is the Union of Riflemen, an organization which existed before the war and was resurrected in March this year. The Riflemen say that their goal is the teaching of firmness of spirit and genuine Lithuaian patriotism. This does not prevent them from interfering in politics or reacting to debates in the legislature. We warn all politicians that any attempts against the declaration of independence will be viewed as treachery, it was said in speeches outside the Supreme Council's building. [video shows meeting outside the Supreme Council attended by men in grey uniforms and ordinary citizens, some wearing green armbands with a yellow shield in the center]

A separate warning in case of possible treachery has been given to the Independent Lithuanian Communist Party, which is still tolerated by the Riflemen. But the Communist Party remaining in the CPSU is regarded as the most dangerous enemy. It is not very pleasant to have such an enemy as the Riflemen. [video shows the Riflemen marching as a column through the streets carrying flags]

Today 3,000 men took the oath. On Gedeminas Hill the Union increased its membership. This paramilitary organizaiton does not carry arms at present, but the Riflemen are divided into subunits. They are distinguished by their strict discipline and are loyal to the flag. The flag also has its history. It was taken to the United States from Lithuania in 1944 and returned here fairly recently. The Riflemen say neither Bolshevism or internationalism destroyed their spirit. Taking the oath, they swear to defend Lithuania, not sparing their lives, to carry out the orders of their commanders precisely and to immediately inform their command about attempts by their enemies to form contacts with them. [video shows meeting of riflemen taking the oath and kissing their flag]

Vytautas Landsbergis approves of the idea of the union. It is a way of struggling against the moral disintegration which they foisted on us earlier, he said at a meeting with journalists.

From what enemies is the Union of Riflemen to defend Lithuania? [video shows Landsbergis being interviewed by journalists]

Estonian Official Presents Credentials in Vilnius

LD0505090190 Vilnius Domestic Service in Lithuanian 1900 GMT 4 May 90

[Summary] Today Mart Parmak, the permanent representative of the Estonian government in Lithuania, presented his credentials to Lithuanian Deputy Prime Minister Romualdas Ozolas.

The ceremony was attended by Lithuanian Foreign Minister Algirdas Saudargas, Deputy Foreign Minister Valdas Katkus, and other officials.

Remarks on Aid

LD0505022590 Vilnius International Service in English 2130 GMT 4 May 90

[Excerpts] A news conference was held at the Lithuanian Ministry for Foreign Affairs today. Lithuanian and foreign journalists met the newly appointed permanent representative of the Estonian government in the Republic of Lithuania, Mart Parmak, and the adviser of the Estonian mission in Vilnius, (Valvis Drikaitina). Present at the news conference was also the guest of honor, the 77-year-old (Erik Lippstok), the attache of the Estonian Embassy in Lithuania from 1938 to 1940.

Addressing the journalists, Mart Parmak, aged 35 and a graduate of Tartu University in Estonia, spoke fluent Lithuanian, which he had learned on his own. [Parmak is heard speaking in Lithuanian in background]

This day is very important and pleasant, both to Estonia and Lithuania, because after a 50 year break we have re-established diplomatic links, says Mart Parmak. The Estonian mission will have its premises in Vilnius, not in Kauhnas, as it was before the Second World War. The mission is a diplomatic institution of the Estonian government so its functions are to represent the Estonian government, to defend its interests in the Republic of Lithuania, to conduct talks between the two countries and to inform our government about the current developments in Lithuania. So far the Estonian mission has a staff of only three people, just like it was before the war, Mart Parmak said.

Commenting on and comparing the roads to independence chosen by Estonia and Lithuania, Mart Parmak pointed out that he saw more similiarites than differences. Judging by the legislative acts which the parliaments of the two countries adopt, the way of action of both countries is in essence the same. The permanent Estonian representative in Lithuania re-affirmed the resolve of the government of his republic to render assistance to the Republic of Lithuania in these hard times of the economic blockade.

Estonia will continue helping Lithuania as much as it can, says Mart Parmak. Yesterday our Premier Edgar Savisaar said that despite the orders from Moscow, production will be delivered to Lithuania by railway. In accordance with the recently signed treaty on the Baltic market, Estonian enterprises will fulfill all their economic commitments to Lithuania. Of course, our help will not play a decisive role in overcoming the effects of the blockade, said the permanent representative of the Estonian government in the Republic of Lithuania, Mart Parmak.

The adviser of the Estonian mission in Lithuania, (Valvis Drikaitina) added some more details about Lithuania's help to Lithuania. [as heard] [Drikaitina is heard speaking in Lithuanian in background]

The 9th of May has been proclaimed in Estonia a working day in support of Lithuania, says (Valvis Drikaitina). All the funds raised on that day will be transferred to the Lithuanian blockade foundation. All Estonia, even retired pensioners, are willing to make their contribution in helping Lithuania. [passage omitted]

With that the brief news conference at the Lithuanian Ministry for Foreign Affairs was concluded. The Lithuanian government is expected to appoint its permanent representative in Estonia next week. Going by unofficial data, a few candidates to the post have already been considered.

Savisaar, Military Official Discuss Militia

LD0705084690 Tallinn Domestic Service in Estonian 1700 GMT 6 May 90

[Text] Today, Edgar Savisaar, chairman of the Estonian Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR] government, met Major General (Aleksandr Zhitnikov), division commander of USSR internal forces. The request of our government—the prompt return of the Tallinn militia regiment to its homeland—was discussed.

As is known, many young men who come from Estonia are serving in this regiment. Some time ago, the regiment was moved from Estonia to Transcaucasia.

Also taking part in the meeting was Olev Laanjarv, Estonian SSR minister of internal affairs. Our editorial board does not yet know the result of the meeting. Hopefully, the talks are proceeding favorably.

Minister Urges Ethnic Reconciliation in Estonia

LD0505111590 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0500 GMT 5 May 90

[Text] Tallinn, 5 May (TASS)—Ruta Pels, a correspondent for the ESTONIAN TELEGRAPH AGENCY, reports:

"The thrust of nationalities policy should be directed toward national reconciliation." Such is the view of Artur Kuznetsov, a minister of the Estonian SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic].

Together with experts, the minister without portfolio, whose responsibilities include the solution of inter-ethnic questions, intends to draft a detailed program which will take account of the interests of all nationalities living in Estonia.

Artur Kuznetsov himself is Russian by nationality. He is a native of Pechory Rayon of Pskov Oblast, which neighbors Estonia. He was an initiator and organizer of the Russian cultural society in the university town of Tartu, where he worked as a senior scientific official of the Estonian Academy of Science Physics Institute after completing his studies. The cultural society's work, and also Kuznetsov's participation in the setting-up and activities of the Forum—now Association—of Estonian Peoples, which represents 18 national culture societies, allows one to assume that the new minister holds the "keys" to the complex and very delicate questions of inter-ethnic relations.

Artur Kuznetsov believes that "the Estonian SSR laws on the national rights of Estonian SSR citizens and associations of citizens' have created the foundations for the development and cooperation of all people living in Estonia.... Later on we will adopt laws which will help reinforce the Estonian people's confidence in the future, resolve the problems of Estonians in the northeast of the republic, where they are currently a national minority, and tackle the problems of national groups belonging to

the Association of Estonian Peoples. A particularly important question is the molding of Estonia's Russian community."

The minister believes that one of the most acute problems at the moment which must be resolved is the question of internal reconciliation among the Russian community. Sociological research shows that the Russian-speaking population of Estonia, which makes up almost 40 percent of the total, is not homogeneous. The interests of the different groups vary. The interests of those born and raised in Estonia differ from those who came to Estonia to obtain highly paid work and modern housing, and from those who came here because they had no choice—believers and victims of repression, Karelians for example.

"All groups of the population require attention. That is why the post of minister responsible for inter-ethnic questions has been created in the Estonian SSR government," says Arnold Ryuytel, chairman of the Estonian SSR Supreme Soviet Presidium. "During the talks which have now started in Moscow, the interests of all groups of the population, including Russian speakers, must of course be represented."

Deputy on Estonian Supreme Soviet Progress

LD0705104490 Tallinn Domestic Service in Estonian 0900 GMT 7 May 90

[Interview with People's Deputy Rein Veidemann, member of the board of the Popular Front, by correspondent Raul Malk; date, place not given—live or recorded; monitored in progress]

[Excerpts] [Malk] [passage omitted] This morning, what was discussed here most of all, perhaps, was Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania—all three together. The swift advance on the part of the Latvians has, perhaps, made a number of people's deputies here feel as if we have somehow lagged behind and that now one should begin to do something quickly. People's Deputy Rein Veidemann, what is one to think of this?

[Veidemann] Yes, I agree here with speaker Enn Poldroos, who opened his speech by saying that he was ashamed. Indeed, I also feel deeply depressed in this respect, for the reason that we, well, that indecision is reigning here, first of all. Second, that conscientious counteraction, obstruction has taken shape very clearly: Counteraction on the part of deputies of equal rights and communists, deputies who stand on the platform of the communists. They have, well, they have set it as their aim to slow down the speed, and, to lead matters consistently into a kind of web. That is true. So it is that we are constantly busy with discussing the others, with sending telegrams to the others, with observing the processes of the others, but as far as our own state is concerned, we seemingly have allowed ourselves to sit idle. That is very painful to me.

Now I hope that today we finally will come down to deciding something—a hope I had lost over the past weeks—and that we will come back to the draft law on Estonian symbols. That is, I would like to draw one's attention to the fact that this draft is not, that is, it deals with the same issues which Latvia simply succeeded in dealing with within one evening. That is, well, well, this so-to-speak destruction of the Latvian Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR], the (?removal) of the SSR, as such—and we would do the same through our law on symbols, so that we have to get so far—we will not say we want to arrive at the Republic of Estonia. Well, at present we will indeed not arrive that far, but we would arrive at Estonia, at least. That would mean that we are no longer an SSR. So let us arrive that far, so we will no longer have to use this existing flag, those coats of arms we have had up to now, which are not, indeed, even in agreement with the 30 March resolution we adopted, but we got stuck at that point. We are still halfway down the road and in a mess. So I hope that this will be one of the main issues to be dealt with now.

However, as far as taking a stance with respect to Lithuania is concerned, with respect to the economic sanctions, which we also spent two days on and did not get anywhere, it would indeed be ridiculous if we now started discussing this again. It is the fate of the Baltics as a whole which is at stake. Indeed, we must deal from morning to night with the issues of the fate of the whole Baltics, and not just two or three days a week, but by whole weeks instead.

[Malk] I think that Latvia's address also is awaiting a reply. That was aimed at us, via Arnold Ryuytel [chairman of the Estonian Supreme Soviet], to the effect of indeed establishing prompt state cooperation among the Baltic states.

[Veidemann] Quite so! The prime introduction to this should be an address to Latvia, to be adopted today still, which indeed would recognize their step and assure them that we are still in the same boat, even if the impression may be that we are already lagging behind. [passage omitted]

Latvian Parliament Adopts Message to Gorbachev

LD0505091290 Moscow TASS in English 0904 GMT 5 May 90

[Text] Riga May 5 TASS—By TASS correspondent Valeriy Zaytsev:

The Latvian parliament, which on Friday passed a declaration on the restoration of Latvia's state independence, adopted a message to Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev.

The message says that "The May 4 manifesto only opens the door to a transition period—a period of close dialogue and the elaboration of guarantees of mutual interests.

"Ahead lies a period of close cooperation and wide political, economic and human contacts."

The parliament warned that "it would be short-sighted to sever the established historical, economic and human ties."

The parliament also adopted messages to the governments of the world and the leaders of Lithuania and Estonia.

Latvian President Anatoliy Gorbunov told a news conference that "the process of establishing state independence should proceed in a dialogue."

He said negotiations with the Soviet Union at experts' level were expected to begin on May 15.

Latvian Parliament Expected To Elect Premier

LD0705123390 Moscow TASS in English 1222 GMT 7 May 90

[by TASS correspondent Galina Kuchina]

[Text] Riga May 7 TASS—The Latvian parliament resumed its session on Monday. Deputies are expected to elect a new prime minister.

The People's Front group, wielding the majority in parliament, nominated physicist Ivars Godmanis, the front's deputy chairman, for the post.

Analysts believe that Latvian Supreme Soviet Chairman Anatoliy Gorbunov, a member of the Front's group in parliament, will nominate Godmanis for the prime minister's post today.

The candidate will set out his program and reply to some difficult questions caused by the declaration of independence.

Latvian residents have responded to the independence declaration by panic buying.

Ivans Comments on Latvian Independence Declaration

AU0605133190 Paris AFP in English 0900 GMT 6 May 90

[Text] Moscow, May 6 (AFP)—The Latvian parliament "will change nothing" in its declaration of independence, voted democratically by members, first deputy speaker and nationalist Popular Front leader Dainis Ivans said Sunday. But Mr. Ivans, questioned by phone from Moscow, said his statement was "not an official reply" to Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev's rejection on Saturday of Latvian independence and his threat to impose economic sanctions on the Baltic republic.

"This is a private conversation. Parliament will not discuss this matter until it has been informed officially, probably on Monday" of the Soviet leader's reaction, Mr. Ivans said. Mr. Gorbachev's position was given on Latvian television on Saturday evening by Alfred Rubiks, first secretary of the Latvian Communist Party, which has stayed loyal to Moscow.

Mr. Ivans said: "We cannot accept the legislation which Moscow is trying to enforce upon us. That is definite and we will not go back on it." The three Baltic republics, which were forcibly annexed by Stalin in 1940, have rejected legislation on the procedure for secession passed in March by the Supreme Soviet in Moscow. This legislation, which would make secession virtually impossible, calls for a referendum in the republic seeking to secede with a two-third majority in favour of independence. After that, the move must be endorsed by the Congress of People's Deputies, the full Soviet parliament.

Mr. Ivans said that Latvians had "been preparing for some time" for an eventual economic blockade by Moscow, but it would be harder for non-Latvians to accept the restrictions needed to resist a blockade.

Rubiks on Gorbachev Opposition to Declaration

LD0505215390 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 2110 GMT 5 May 90

[Text] Riga, 6 May (TASS)—"The USSR president believes that the Latvian legislature's adoption on 4 May of its declaration on reestablishment of the independence of the Republic of Latvia is a breach of constitutional norms that is leading to the breakdown of state ties between the republic and the USSR." The opinion of the president has, on his instructions, been conveyed to the people of Latvia by Alfreds Rubiks, first secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Latvia, a USSR people's deputy and member of the USSR Supreme Soviet, who has had a telephone conversation with Mikhail Gorbachev.

Speaking on republican television late on the evening of 5 May, Alfreds Rubiks set out in detail the position of the president. He said Gorbachev regards as invalid all attempts to present the declaration as a document that charts a path toward the republic's secession from the Soviet Union that differs from the Lithuanian version.

As Alfreds Rubiks reported, the USSR president stressed that talks are only possible if the republic respects the USSR Constitution. There can be no question of talks without the reestablishment of the pre-4 May state status of the Latvian SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic]. In the event that the republic ignores the USSR Constitution, the president reserves the right to take retaliatory political, economic, and administrative measures.

More on Gorbachev View

LD0605120690 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1107 GMT 6 May 90

[Text] Riga, 6 May (TASS)—Speaking yesterday on Latvian television, Alfreds Rubiks, a USSR people's deputy and member of the USSR Supreme Soviet,

reported that he had had a conversation with the country's president. Carrying out the instructions of Mikhail Gorbachev, the deputy passed on the president's opinion of the outcome of the second day of work at the session of the Latvian Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR] Supreme Soviet.

A. Rubiks went on to say that the USSR president believes that the adoption on 4 May of a declaration on the reestablishment of the independence of the Republic of Latvia is a breach of constitutional norms which is leading to the breakdown of state ties between the republic and the USSR. All attempts to present the declaration as being handled in the republic's own, particular way, as distinct from Lithuania, are invalid. The thesis of a transitional period and the establishment of a new state authority is quite devoid of foundation, since there has been no mutual agreement on this. The president stressed that talks are only possible if the Union republic respects the USSR Constitution, and only within the body of the USSR. There can be no question of talks without the reestablishment of the pre-4 May state status of the Latvian SSR. In the event that the republic ignores the USSR Constitution, the president reserves the right to take retaliatory political, economic, and administrative measures.

Speaking on his own behalf, as a republican people's deputy, A. Rubiks felt it necessary to add that "the adoption of the declaration has created a hopelessly critical situation on the path to the republic's real sovereignty, based not on political documents and declarations but on the solution of serious economic and social problems. What is most worrying about this situation is the fact that the ones who will suffer as a result are the people whose destiny has been handled in such an irresponsible manner.

"One possible solution to the situation is for the declaration to be suspended until all the problems affecting relations between the Latvian SSR and USSR have been reviewed and a referendum has been held. If, in this event, the people opt for independence outside the Soviet Union, this should be accomplished in strict conformity with the USSR law on the procedures for settling questions related to the secession of a Union republic from the USSR."

The speaker recalled that when the declaration was adopted, 59 deputies from the "equal rights" group, which is mostly made up of supporters of the Latvian Communist Party, decided not to take part in the voting. They stated that the declaration was contrary to the Soviet Constitution and the Constitution of the Latvian SSR, that it had not been submitted for nationwide debate, and that its adoption signified a change in the republic's state system. The declaration was included on the session's agenda as an additional item, at the insistence of the Latvian People's Front deputies. In spite of the fact that it contained substantial contradictions and distortions of historical fact, and that it was basically oriented toward Latvia's secession from the Soviet Union, the discussion concerning it was carried out in great haste, without serious analysis, the deputy said. The people were not told that the consequences of such a step, which affects the fate of millions of people, could be unpredictably grave for them.

We have already seen, A. Rubiks said, although some people are delighted by this move, others cannot hide their alarm about what it means for their future. This is understandable. It is by no means the case that everyone supports the idea of Latvia's secession from the USSR, A. Rubiks stressed.

Gorbunov on Latvian Declaration, Dialogue

LD0605181990 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1700 GMT 6 May 90

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] Here is an excerpt from an address by Anatoliy Gorbunov, chairman of the Latvian Supreme Soviet.

[Begin Gorbunov recording] The declaration defines a transitional period, which is starting now. During this transitional period—for which, incidentally, no time limits have been set because it is, indeed, a process—during this transitional period the Latvian Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR] Constitution and the USSR Constitution will be in force because the Latvian SSR Constitution is tied up with the USSR Constitution. Yet there is a reservation to that. All those articles will be in force which do not contradict the proclaimed principles and our strivings for restoring state sovereignty.

No doubt one should be guided by the realities of today, in other words, of the year 1990, not 1922, in adopting a new constitution and drafting it. I don't think any comments are required here. What, in my view, is the most important for us now? The declaration adopted by the republican supreme soviet does not close the doors to dialogue either in the republic or in Moscow. Of course, the adopted declaration can be appraised critically, too, but this is the basis which, in our view, can really ensure dialogue. Neither a new republican constitution nor economic laws will be adopted without consulting all the residents of our republic. The main thing is that there should be a desire to conduct such a dialogue. I understand that there is a difference of views, and a considerable one. Let us begin by listening to different opinions; we will be comparing arguments instead of simply threatening blockades and clinging to the past.

As for me personally, respected television viewers, I would like to assure you that I will do everything in my power to ensure that in this complex period, the Supreme Soviet ascertains all the moods of the people in our republic and truly embodies people's power in our republic. [end recording]

Latvian 4 May Supreme Soviet Session Concludes

Relations With USSR Viewed

LD0405144190

[Editorial Report] Riga Domestic Service in Latvian at 1239 GMT on 4 May continues its live relay of the Latvian Supreme Soviet session in Riga.

At 1239 GMT Plotnieks begins to speak about the evils of centralization. He says that the declaration of independence should be adopted immediately, and he has some proposals. He says that the basis is the declaration of the Republic of Latvia in 1917. We shall be taking over everything and continuing it, he says. According to Plotnieks, relations with the USSR, as expressed in an article of the declaration, is too weak. He suggests an addition to Article No. 9 concerning cooperation.

At 1250 GMT an unnamed speaker in Russian warns of dangers of present increasing tension in Latvia. He regrets the attacks on sacred Soviet values like the October Revolution. He speaks against secession from the USSR, and says that Daugavpils electors want full economic independence within a renewed Soviet Federation. He reads out an appeal from a mass meeting recently held in Daugavpils attacking moves towards secession, and warning that if secession goes ahead, they will take steps to "protect their interests". He demands a referendum .

At 1255 GMT Kezbers begins to speak. He talks about double standards—there have been apologies to Czechoslovakia, Hungary, and Afghanistan, but not where Stalinism was at its most beastly. It was interesting how Rubiks had spoken in the name of all communists, but this is not true, says Kezbers. Kezbers says that the declaration of independence should be adopted today.

At 1300 GMT Indulis Berzins speaks about how the Baltic peoples' struggle is connected with opponents in other parts of the Soviet Union. The May Day demonstration in Moscow supported Lithuania, he says. Dynamic processes are under way in Europe. We must hurry up and join it, now or never, he says.

At 1305 GMT (Cheskov), speaking in Russian, says that his view does not coincide with that of the overwhelming majority. We must go our own way, not follow anybody's particular example, says (Cheskov). Many people share the view of one voter that the local media today is as full of references to the People's Front as it used to be of mentions of the CPSU. He recalls disadvantages that faced Russians in education under the interwar republic. Hitler used both nationalism and socialism to arouse the Germans: such abuses of these good ideas should be avoided, says (Cheskov). We must acknowledge our responsibility to ensure the victory of the new thinking. The ideal must be to avoid confrontation in building the new Latvia. Progress is possible only on the basis of a new Union treaty, so I cannot support the present declaration, Cheskov asserts. People need economic success, not hungry liberty, he concludes.

At 1315 GMT Gorbunov suggests restricting the number of speakers. He says that Dimanis and Vulfsons remain, although he knows that Alekseyev and another would object. Another speaker reminds him that Berklav should be allowed to speak. Godmanis, head of the majority faction, proposes that four more people should be allowed to speak.

At 1328 GMT Gorbunov talks about the registration equipment. It is noted that 194 deputies are present.

At 1322 GMT a vote is held on who should be allowed to speak. At 1323 GMT a decision is made to allow the proposed four speakers. This is approved by 123 votes.

At 1325 GMT Alekseyev begins speaking in Russian. Alekseyev talks of the importance of the independence declaration to be voted on. He warns of the dangers of a split among the people, with a worsening economic situation. He attacks deputies by name who failed to remedy things before, and he expresses doubts on the trustworthiness of people like Gorbunov and Bresis. Having read the declaration, he proposes an amendment, and challenges Gorbunov. Gorbunov warns Alekseyev against attacking Deputy Bels by name and threatens him with the Ethics Committee.

At 1330 GMT Bojars objects to some being given the floor many times, while others had to beg. Speaking in Russian, he tells the Russians that they should understand that without independence, they could not be guaranteed any rights. Continuing in Latvian, he talks about legal aspects, and proposes some alterations to the text of the independence declaration. He then voices some objections to what Rubiks said about 1940, and he talks about the attitude of electors.

At 1336 GMT Dimanis explains why he did not greet Landsbergis yesterday—he says he does not agree with irresponsible politicians.

At 1342 GMT Vulfsons talks about awaiting independence for 50 years. He says the fate of Latvia should not be decided in Moscow, but in Latvia, in Riga. He asks the Russian comrades to consider what they are doing. They are sticking to the idea of federation, whereas Gorbachev, in Moscow, is talking about confederation. The declaration of independence would not be stopped by blackmail, he says. Gorbachev did not take a risk of increasing the conflict in Lithuania, he knew that 31 May was ahead, Vulfsons concludes. At 1347 GMT a 30-minute break is announced.

Draft Declaration Debated

LD0405153590

[Editorial Report] Riga Domestic Service in Latvian at 1414 GMT on 4 May resumes its live relay from the

Latvian Supreme Soviet session in Riga. The session is still in break, and correspondents are conducting interviews.

At 1421 GMT Gorbunov starts the proceedings.

At 1423 GMT a Russian deputy replies to Bojars.

At 1424 GMT a report is made on behalf of the Editorial Commission. It states that an insignificant correction has been made to the independence declaration; the proposals had not added any new concepts. The distributed text should be put to a vote. A speaker says that the question of independence had been discussed by the Latvian people since 1940. Another Russian speaker raises objections about the constitutional nature of the declaration. These objections are rebutted on behalf of the Editorial Commission and by Gorbunov.

At 1428 GMT a Russian speaking deputy from Riga raises the dangers of the political consequences of adopting the declaration. His objections are dismissed.

At 1430 GMT a Russian deputy asks whether the Editorial Commission has examined the flood of letters against the declaration. The Editorial Commission representative responds that this is beyond the Editorial Commission.

At 1432 GMT there is a proposal to stop the questions: 138 vote support this proposal.

At 1435 GMT Deputy Zotov speaks in Russian warning of the consequences of the declaration.

At 1436 GMT Deputy Apsitis reads the draft declaration on restoration of independence of the Republic of Latvia. It begins with historical details on the establishment of the republic. It moves on to discuss the events of 1940 and says the aggression of the USSR against Latvia should be qualified as a crime. It talks of illegal Saeima elections and the falsification of the results. A free ballot by the people did not take place. The Latvian Republic is still recognized de jure by more than 50 countries. The Supreme Soviet decisions, including those about the agreement between USSR and Germany and the declaration on joining the USSR should be regarded as illegal, says the draft declaration.

Details of the articles of the declaration of independence are given. There will be a provisional period until the Seimas is convened, and the Supreme Soviet will represent state power during the transition period. There are provisions for foreigners and for relations with the USSR. The declaration comes into force from the moment of its adoption.

At 1446 GMT discussion begins on the voting procedure. At 1449 GMT the delegates vote to hold a secret ballot: 136 vote for, 30 against, with no abstentions. Practical procedures concerning ballot papers and other details are explained until 1452 GMT.

At 1453 GMT on behalf of the "Equality Faction", a statement signed by Dimanis and Alksnis is read out, attacking the declaration as unconstitutional. Another Russian tries to issue a protest.

At 1500 GMT the tellers are asked to arrange the ballot.

Independence Declaration Adopted

LD0405163390

[Editorial Report] Riga Domestic Service in Latvian at 1620 GMT on 4 May in its live relay of the Latvian Supreme Soviet session in Riga announces that the Latvian Supreme Soviet has adopted an independence declaration.

The vote on the declaration of independence is announced as follows: for: 138 votes; against: no votes; one abstention. A total of 57 did not participate in the voting. The result of the vote was announced individually, that is, the name of each deputy was read, followed by how she or he voted or failed to vote.

Gorbunov Closes Session

LD0405164990

[Editorial Report] Riga Domestic Service in Latvian at 1620 GMT on 4 May continues its live relay of the Latvian Supreme Soviet session in Riga. After the announcement of the result of the voting on the declaration of independence Gorbunov declares the session closed. The Latvian national anthem is then sung and Gorbunov announces that a press conference is to be held.

At 1634 GMT the live relays ends.

Latvian Declaration of Independence Issued

LD0405223190 Riga Domestic Service in Latvian 1436 GMT 4 May 90

[Declaration on the restoration of Latvian state independence, read by Deputy Apsitis at the Latvian Supreme Soviet session in Riga—live relay]

[Text] Esteemed chairman of the Supreme Soviet, esteemed deputies of the Supreme Soviet. My task is to read the draft declaration:

The declaration of the Supreme Soviet of the Latvian Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR] on the restoration of the independence of the Republic of Latvia.

The independent state of Latvia proclaimed on 18 November 1918 was internationally recognized in 1920, and in 1921 became an equal rights' member of the League of Nations. The Latvian nation realized its self-determination legally in April 1920, when in universal, equal, direct, and proportional elections the mandate of the people's trust was given to the Constituent

Assembly. In February 1922 it adopted the state's fundamental law, the Constitution of the Republic of Latvia which has been juridically in force to this moment.

The 16 June 1940 ultimatum of the Stalinist USSR Government of that time delivered to the government of the Republic of Latvia with the demand to change the government, and the military aggression by the USSR of 17 June 1940, are to be qualified as an international crime. The result of this was the occupation of Latvia and the liquidation of the sovereign state power of the Republic of Latvia.

The government of Latvia was formed by the dictate of representatives of the USSR Government. From the standpoint of international law this government was not an executive organ of the sovereign state power of the Republic of Latvia, because it did not represent the interests of the Republic of Latvia, but those of the USSR.

On 14 and 15 July 1940 in the occupied Latvia, under the conditions of political terror, elections to the Saeima were held according to an illegally adopted anticonstitutional law on elections. Of the 17 lists of candidates submitted, only one, the list of candidates of the Bloc of the Working People, was allowed.

The demand for proclaiming Soviet power in Latvia and entry of the Republic of Latvia into the Soviet Union was not proposed in the preelection platform of the Bloc of the Working People. Moreover, the election results were falsified.

The illegally formed Saeima, as a result of deceiving the people, did not express the sovereign will of the people of Latvia. It did not possess constitutional rights to decide the question on changing the state system and liquidating the sovereignty of the state of Latvia. Only the people had the right to decide these questions, but a free ballot by the people did not take place. Therewith, the incorporation of the Republic of Latvia into the Soviet Union from the standpoint of international law is not in force, and the Republic of Latvia still exists de jure as a subject of international law, recognized by more than 50 countries of the world.

Taking into consideration the 28 July 1989 declaration of the Latvian SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] Supreme Soviet on the sovereignty of the state of Latvia, the 15 February 1990 declaration on the question of the state of independence of Latvia, and 21 April 1990 appeal at the all-Latvia people's deputies meeting; taking into consideration the will of the inhabitants of Latvia unmistakably expressed by electing a majority of deputies who in their pre-election program expressed resolve in restoring the state independence of the Republic of Latvia; and taking a stand on the road of de facto restoration of a free, democratic, and independent Republic of Latvia, the Latvian SSR Supreme Soviet decides:

1. To recognize the priority of basic principles of international law over the norms of state rights. To regard as illegal the 23 August 1939 agreement between the USSR and Germany and the 17 June 1940 liquidation of the sovereign state power of the Republic of Latvia as a result of a military aggression by the USSR arising from that.

2. To declare as not in force, at the moment of its adoption, the declaration adopted by the council [saeima] of Latvia on 21 July 1940 on the entry of Latvia into the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

3. To restore the validity of the Constitution of the Republic of Latvia, adopted on 15 February 1922, in the entire territory of Latvia. The official title of state of Latvia is the Republic of Latvia, in abbreviated form Latvia.

4. Until the adoption of a new wording of the Constitution, to suspend the Constitution of the Republic of Latvia, except those articles which lay down the constitutionally legal foundation of the state of Latvia and which in accordance with Article 77 of the Constitution can be changed only by a ballot of the people. Namely:

Article 1: Latvia is an independent democratic republic;

Article 2: the sovereign power of the state of Latvia belongs to the people of Latvia;

Article 3: the territory of the state of Latvia, within the boundaries determined by international treaties, consists of Vidzeme, Latgale, Kurzeme, and Zemgale;

Article 6: the council is elected by universal, equal, direct, secret, and proportional ballot; and

Article 6 of the Constitution is to be adopted with the renewal of those state power and administrative structures which guarantee the process of free elections.

5. To lay down a transitional period for the de facto restoration of the state power of the Republic of Latvia which ends with the convening of the council of the Republic of Latvia. During the transitional period the supreme state power in Latvia is realized by the Supreme Soviet of the Republic of Latvia.

6. To regard as possible during the transitional period of adopting the norms of the Latvian SSR Constitution and other legislative acts which at the moment of adoption of this decision are operating in the territory of Latvia, as long as they do not contradict Articles 1, 2, 3, and 6 of the Constitution of the Republic of Latvia. In cases of dispute, the questions on adoption of legislative acts are decided by the Constitutional Court of the Republic of Latvia. During the transitional period new legislative acts are adopted or the existing acts are altered only by the Supreme Soviet of the Republic of Latvia.

7. To form a commission in order to draw up a new wording of the Constitution of the Republic of Latvia corresponding to the current political, economic, and social situation of Latvia.

8. To guarantee to the citizens of the Republic of Latvia and of the other countries, who reside permanently in the territory of Latvia; social, economic, and cultural rights, and also political liberties corresponding to generally recognized international human rights norms. This is to be applied to the full extent to those USSR citizens who express the wish to live in Latvia without adopting its citizenship.

9. Regarding the relations of the Republic of Latvia with the USSR to be formed in accordance with the 11 August 1920 peace treaty between Latvia and Russia, which is still in force and in which the independence of the state of Latvia is recognized forever; a government commission is to be formed for the talks with the USSR.

The declaration comes into force from the moment of its adoption.

Further on Declaration

AU0405163890 Paris AFP in English 1624 GMT 4 May 90

[Text] Riga, May 4 (AFP)—Latvia on Friday declared independence from the Soviet Union, the third of the Baltic republics to break with Moscow.

An AFP correspondent reported that the parliament in Riga, the Latvian capital, voted by 138 votes in favour and one blank vote to restore independence, but it also called for a "transition period" to ease the way to secession. Fifty-seven pro-Moscow deputies boycotted the vote.

The duration of this transition period was not specified, but deputies have spoken of "two to three years". The parliamentary declaration said that the "sovereign Republic of Latvia (which was independent from 1920 to 1940) never ceased to exist de jure and is today re-established de facto."

This return to independence, however, "must be enacted in the course of a transition period under the direction of the Supreme Council," the new name given to parliament. During this transition period, the current Constitution will remain in force, but four articles from the former Constitution of independent Latvia will also be enacted.

These state that Latvia is an "independent and democratic republic," that it is made up of four regions (Vidzeme, Zemgale, Latgale, Kurzeme), that parliament is elected according to a system of proportional representation and that "the power of the state belongs to the people"—this last article is taken to imply there will be direct presidential elections in the republic.

Latvia, from Soviet Socialist Republic, changes its name to "Republic of Latvia."

Negotiations with the Soviet Union on implementing independence are to be conducted by a government commission, according to the resolution.

No mention was made of the problem of Soviet military bases in the Baltic republic.

The other two Baltic republics, forcibly annexed by Moscow in 1940 under the Molotov-Ribbentrop pact, have also moved to break with Moscow.

Lithuania adopted its unilateral declaration of independence on March 11; and Estonia, on March 30, voted to declare itself under illegal "Soviet occupation" and ruled that the republic now entered "a period of transition" prior to the formation of new institutions which will take over from Soviet-imposed ones.

TASS Reports on 4 May Latvian Supreme Soviet

LD0405184790 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1722 GMT 4 May 90

[By TASS correspondent Galina Kuchina]

[Text] Riga, 4 May (TASS)—The Latvian Supreme Soviet's second day of work had a stormy start. On behalf of 131 deputies, Ivars Godmanis, leader of the People's Front faction, proposed that the discussion of a declaration on restoring the Latvian Republic's independence and some other documents—including an address to the peoples of Latvia, to world governments, and a message to USSR President Mikhail Gorbachev—be put on the agenda.

Objections from the minority followed. The documents had been distributed just that morning, and there had been too little time to read them. In addition to that—in accordance with the republican Constitution—adoption of important republican decisions must be preceded by the examination of the documents in standing commissions or by a nationwide ballot.

An address to the deputies by some Liepaja electors, which was read at the session, mentioned that the adoption of acts on restoring state independence will sharply exacerbate interethnic relations, which are complex enough; will destabilize the political situation; and will upset ties with fraternal republics, something that will worsen Latvia's economic situation and the living standards of the working people. The authors of the letter think that all of this may have tragic consequences.

Having listened to all the arguments, including protests against the fact that the opposition had been reduced to the role of extras, the participants in the session adopted a package of documents for examination. The "Equality" [ravnopraviye] federalist faction refused to participate in the work of the editorial commission.

Before discussing the documents, the session adopted provisionary rules on factions. According to them, the formation of a faction is allowed if it numbers more than 20 people. Proportional representation of such groups in standing commissions is envisaged. If a deputy leaves the ranks of his like-minded colleagues, he is expelled from the commission, too, and a new representative of

the deputy group is elected to it. The leaders of such groups have an extraordinary right to speak on any issue.

A proposal on forbidding the parliament's leadership to participate in factions was rejected.

The session adopted a declaration on restoring the Latvian republic's independence: 138 deputies voted for it, one abstained, and the other deputies did not take part in the voting [as received]. (Altogether, there are 201 seats in the Latvian parliament, and several mandates have not yet been distributed.) A transitional period, which should result in the convocation of the saeima, has been determined. The document says that the official name of the Latvian state is Latvian Republic, or Latvia, for short.

Moscow TV Inteviews Gorbunov on Independence

LD0405194690 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1700 GMT 4 May 90

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] [Announcer] The first session of the new Latvian Supreme Soviet is continuing its work in Riga. This is what our correspondents have just reported from Riga:

[Correspondent N. Kasayanova] Late yesterday evening the deputies elected the chairman of the Latvian Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR] Supreme Soviet, his deputies and secretary. [video shows hall full of deputies; cuts to show Kasyanova interviewing Gorbunov, chairman of the Latvian Supreme Soviet]

[Gorbunov] Two major factions have already been formed here: the majority—the Popular Front, and one can say, the opposition, the Communist Party. I think that such a good confrontation will be conducive to adopting businesslike decisions and resolutions in the Supreme Soviet, taking into account the entire political spectrum in our republic.

It should not be the case that our decisions, which the Supreme Soviet will adopt in the republic, should pain some, or arouse great concern, or arouse exultation among others. And this, of course, in the first place, will concern the issue of restoring the republic's sovereignty. I think that we will define the main principles of restoring our republic's sovereignty, but the acquisiton of independence itself is a process. And in this process, of course, dialogue must be in first place, I believe—an honest and fra..k dialogue between the people of our republic of various nationalities. And, of course, a dialogue—which we say with great satisfaction—which has begun in Moscow.

[Kasyanova] Heated debates broke out today around the priority of issues on the agenda, whether to decide first the question of the republic's government or, first of all, to adopt a declaration on the restoration of the Latvian SSR's independence. At the insistence of the majority faction the session discussed and adopted the document which determines the destiny of the people for many years. This has revealed various attitudes toward it. The Latvian declaration of independence is less radical than the Lithuanian variant, for it establishes a period of transition, and is more radical than in Estonia, for it renews four clauses of the 1922 Constitution. [video shows deputies in session]

This evening, on the banks of the Daugava River in Riga there was a demonstration, called by the Latvian Popular Front. [video shows overhead view of peaceful, stationary demonstration with many people dressed in national costume]

Gorbunov Addresses Latvian Supreme Soviet 3 May

LD0505185590 Riga Domestic Service in Latvian 1258 GMT 3 May 90

[Address by Anatoliy Gorbunov after being nominated for the chairmanship of the Latvian Supreme Soviet, at the Latvian Supreme Soviet session in Riga—live]

[Excerpts] Esteemed colleague deputies, if my candidacy for the position of chairman of the Supreme Soviet is confirmed I understand very well that I shall undertake responsibility for our legislative work under entirely new conditions of diversity of opinions and a multiparty system. [passage omitted]

My work in this high position can succeed only if all of you are my allies in cultivating multiparty democratic ethics and in forming legislative traditions. [passage omitted]

I am an adherent of a collegial, creative workstyle, and probably at times, as you remember, I have even been overly hesitant, trying to find out all the pros and cons. As you very well know, I have been criticized from all sides for centrism and compromise. [passage omitted]

I feel that from a diversity of viewpoints we must consistently move toward united action. And I shall also take a stand in favor of this if my candidacy is confirmed.

I see as one of the tasks of the new legislature the restoration of law-governed state sovereignty, the restoration of state sovereignty of Latvia, as a means of ensuring a normal life for all inhabitants of Latvia. [passage omitted]

It seems to me that this [restoration of state sovereignty] must be begun by the legal consolidation of man's freedom of choice, by us here in the legislature adopting laws. Man forms the state, and the state forms man. In the formation of a new, free state of Latvia, the stability of internal policy and citizens' sense of security is acutely necessary. Humanitarian and human rights questions must become the cornerstones of the republic's political activity, and as soon as possible the organ of state power of Latvia should adopt documents in which we solemnly declare that Latvia fully assumes the commitments arising from the international treaties signed by the USSR in the sphere of human and citizens' rights and is

ready to further develop international and internal law of the state of Latvia in these areas.

We should not delay issuing official guarantees, before the entire world, that USSR citizens and their descendants who have come to Latvia since the war need not fear for their future after the restoration of Latvian statehood.

We must create confidence that those inhabitants who do not want to change to Latvian citizenship will receive in the same way the generally-recognized guaranteed human rights, including social security, the right to work, education, retirement, and also honor, respect, inviolability of property, and so on.

People must be given clear, juridical guarantees, and an opportunity of choice either to be citizens of the Republic of Latvia or to remain USSR citizens.

The society of Latvia will be stable if a sufficiently effective mechanism for coordinating actual interests existing within it functions. Therefore, it seems to me, we should begin by adopting such laws, and their adoption will be a test of our legislature's democratism, namely, these laws should be on political parties, on mass media, on referendums. Legislative acts on the freedom of conscience, the activity of political organizations at state and law protection establishments, on the rights of national groups, and others must be drawn up.

And now about one of the principal questions. My opinions on how to restore state sovereignty. What kind of precondition do I think should be taken into consideration?

First, evidently we should be guided by the Latvian SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] Supreme Soviet's 28 July 1989 declaration on the sovereignty of the state of Latvia, the 15 February 1990 declaration on the question on state independence of Latvia, and the 21 April 1990 appeal by the meeting of all-Latvia people's deputies.

Second, we should adhere to the will of the inhabitants of Latvia which has been unmistakably expressed by electing in a majority those deputies who in their pre-election program have expressed resolve to restore the state independence of the Republic of Latvia.

And third, to my mind no less important, is that for two years the renewed USSR Federation, which a great many in our republic also supported, has not created any equal rights mechanism concerning legal aspects which would allow the people of Latvia to decide its destiny.

All together this gives us a legal and moral basis for taking a stand on the road to de facto restoration of the Republic of Latvia.

How should we proceed along this road?

I think that first of all it should be declared on what principles state sovereignty should be restored. Personally, it appears to me that the principles of the constitution of the Republic of Latvia can be adopted, if only because of two aspects.

The first aspect: This Satversme, to use the contemporary word or, perhaps, translating into Russian, Constitution, of 1922 has not been replaced by anybody because this could have been done only by a ballot among the entire people. Such a ballot by the people, as you know, did not take place in 1940.

Second, its first, at least two principal articles, and also others, sound topically appropriate to the present situation: Latvia is an independent, democratic republic. The sovereign power of the state of Latvia belongs to the people of Latvia.

The practical restoration of state sovereignty will of course demand a mutual bilateral coordination of interests between the Republic of Latvia and the USSR. For the sake of bilateral interests unilateral decisions will not give us anything—I am convinced of this. But there must also be will on both sides, and therefore I invite the USSR leadership to continue the talks which in practice we have already begun. The transitional period should perhaps be concluded also by a treaty. During the transitional period articles and laws of the Latvian SSR Constitution which do not contradict the restoration of state sovereignty are in effect. By the time of the ballot by the people the new Constitution, or Satversme, will be offered and will be drawn up.

This is how I would briefly describe the road, especially its legal side. [passage omitted]

Under the conditions of a general economic crisis there will be of course many and various complications. All this, too, can be overcome if the interests will be equally coordinated—beginning with individual enterprises and ending with republics. [passage omitted]

Movement toward progress is felt by everybody, first of all in economic prosperity and, therefore, the inhabitants of Latvia will expect from us a matter-of-fact attention to the everyday.

The mood in Latvia will depend to a great extent on how full the shelves in shops are. I am aware of the joint responsibility of the Supreme Soviet and the government to see that the level of economic activity approaches that of political activity. [passage omitted]

Other questions will also have to be tackled right away. There will have to be talks with Moscow about the complicated demilitarization problem in the Baltic region. Hardly anything has been done in Moscow to liberate Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia from the captivity of armaments—unfortunately, such activity has been mostly ours.

Concerning the USSR military, I think that their presence must be established by a treaty which would perhaps be formed along the lines of the basic principles of the 5 October 1939 Mutual Assistance Pact, taking into consideration of course the peculiarities and problems of the present situation. [passage omitted]

I would like to emphasize once more that relations between Latvia and the USSR must be formed upon new principles and take equal rights and mutual respect into consideraiton. Our relations must not become the attitude of the offended toward the stronger, and vice versa. These must demonstrate the wish of both sides to adhere to the will of the peoples and of living in a civilized world.

In this connection the worry of certain Western countries concerning separatism, in quotes, in the Baltic region would be out of place. The statehood of Latvia must be restored by political, legislative methods, and we must prove to the world that we do not at all threaten the dialogue between East and West or the security of Europe, that our activity is not directed toward confrontation.

I think that we all must regard close unity among the Baltic states as vitally important, coordination of efforts in economic and political fields. Latvia, together with Lithuania and Estonia, as (?independent) subjects of interntional law must strive to establish contacts with political and economic structures in Europe and in the world, the European Council, the Nordic Council, the European economic association, the United Nations. [passage omitted] I think we all congratulate the first invitation which has been received by the new legislature of Latvia. Thank you to the Riksdag of Sweden for inviting the deputies and workers of the Supreme Soviet to acquire legislative experience already this May.

Actually, the essence of our foreign policy platform is a wish to realize our peculiar geopolitical and cultural history situation—to build a bridge between West and East.

At this moment, frankly speaking, I must also express concern that we tend to idealize or to sometimes understand in a primitive manner the concept of independence. I know that we ourselves will have to manage with all the difficulties on the road chosen by our people. Strength will of course be given by the process along the common Baltic road together with the brethren peoples in Lithuania and Estonia. However, it is naive to expect aid packages from the West. The leaders of France and West Germany have recommended to the president of Lithuania that he suspend for a time implementing the decisions adopted by the legislature, in order to obtain Moscow's good-will for starting talks. For the sake of 5 million Baltic people the world does not want to risk either the relaxation of tension or disarmament or Mikhail Gorbachev. We must take this into account, by not exaggerating with risky elation about expected support and generous assistance from Western countries.

I repeat, independence must not be only an end in itself. It must be a means for higher work quality and for raising the people's standard of living.

With the idea of a rebirth of Latvia the entire society of the republic must be harmonized. An absolute majority of Latvians and inhabitants of other nationalities wish, after all, only one thing—to live and bring up children in good conditions. To confirm and to help fulfill this is, to my mind, objectively the principal task of the Supreme Soviet, that is, of all our deputies. And I shall try to realize this, in the event that the confidence and the honor of the position of Chairman of the Supreme Soviet is afforded me.

Thank you for your attention. [applause]

Gorbunov Remarks to Latvian Deputies Cited

PM0405214390 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 5 May 90 Morning Edition p 2

[Own correspondent Irina Litvinova report under "Direct Line" rubric: "Latvia Chooses Its Direction"]

[Text] Riga—The session of the newly convened Latvian Supreme Soviet began work in Riga 3 May.

The fate of most questions at the session is predetermined. At least, on the first day there were no upsets for the People's Front, which has a majority. Nor, observers believe, are any expected in the foreseeable future. It is already possible to confidently interview future ministers: The Latvian People's Front faction has approved its list of candidates. It is stressed that political views were of great importance when selecting the candidates. People's Front deputies have not proposed any alternative candidates for the leading positions put forward by the faction. A. Gorbunov, candidate from the Latvian People's Front faction for the post of Supreme Soviet chairman, was mainly "grilled" by deputies opposed to Latvian secession from the Soviet Union. Many of them were amazed by this well-known politician's change of stance on many highly important problems.

"To which party do you belong?"

"I am a card-carrying member of the independent Latvian Communist Party."

"You quoted the words of the USSR president that, in the event of Latvia taking unilateral decisions, there will be no negotiations, but a declaration of independence is already being cited at news conferences. Do you not feel that we are driving the situation into a corner?"

"I am not in favor of secession but of restored statehood. We must become an equal subject of international law."

"It has been reported that a meeting of experts on further improving relations between Latvia and the USSR is set for 15 May. Does this mean that we ourselves are closing the door to negotiations with Moscow?"

"I think we will be able to continue them."

A considerable proportion of the population was surprised (the session was broadcast on television and radio) by Gorbunov's proposed nominations (approved by the Latvian People's Front faction) for the posts of first deputy and deputy chairman of the republic's Supreme Soviet: Daynis Ivans, journalist and chairman of the Latvian People's Front; and Andres Krastynsh, lawyer and one of the leaders of the Latvian National Independence Movement.

Both nominations were approved by a majority vote.

Mr. Landsbergis, invited from neighboring Lithuania, was greeted with a standing ovation; he made a speech and handed over a symbolic torch.

The session will adopt a declaration of independence 4 May after lunch. Although this item is not on the agenda, most deputies have a copy of the text.

RSFSR

Russian Social Democrats Hold Inaugural Congress

LD0405185390 Moscow TASS in English 1744 GMT 4 May 90

[By TASS correspondent Dmitriy Polumin]

[Text] Moscow May 4 TASS—About 300 delegates from Russian social democratic organisations are attending the inaugural congress of the Russian Federation's Social Democratic Party, which opened in Moscow today. The congress, expected to last three days, is also attended by social democrats from the United States, East Germany, Czechoslovakia, and Mongolia.

Russian social democrats reject any ideological monopoly and aim to create a "democratic social system based on the plurality of property and ideas, personal freedom and common human values," Russian People's Deputy Oleg Rumyantsev, who is one of the organisers of the congress, said. The Russian Social Democratic Party will not represent one class. It aims to forge a balance of interest between different social groups, he said.

Russian social democrats are a part of the world social democratic movement, speakers at the congress said. Some of them said they were prepared to begin a political dialogue with all parties and public movements pursuing democratic reforms. Others criticized the Soviet Communist Party and the past 70 years of national development.

Meanwhile, many speakers practically repeated Soviet society and humanisation of socialism. [sentence as received]

On Saturday, the congress will discuss the party programme and rules.

Draft Rules Debated

LD0505205290 Moscow TASS in English 2036 GMT 5 May 90

[Text] Moscow May 6 TASS—The Russian Federation's Social Democratic Party is entering the political arena "as a parliamentary party striving to obtain the right to implement its policy through popular support during the general elections and other democratic ways," says the declaration of the party's basic principles. This is the only programme statement that has so far been adopted at the first founding congress of the new party, which began on Friday.

The Social Democratic Party of Russian (SDPR) is not a party of any one class. It intends to regulate in a democratic manner day-to-day interests of various social groups, the declaration states. Reform is recognised as the only way to accomplish these tasks.

The programme statement names such "corner-stones" of social democrats as unconditional respect for law as the supreme value of modern civilization, the full guarantees of the rights of the individual, the recognition of the people's right to decide the fate of the republic and the state structure, the deideologisation of the state apparatus, as well as culture, the system of education and training.

In the economic sphere the SDPR not only recognizes the plurality of forms of ownership but "seeks to pursue the policy of interested democratic involvement of Russia's citizens in the use of rightful forms of ownership and any forms of disposing of property for the good of man".

According to many delegates to the congress (they total 247) the congress cannot yet be called successful. It has worked for two days and is expected to conclude on Sunday but its basic documents—the rules and the programme—have not yet been approved. Without them the party cannot constitute itself as a full-fledged organisation.

Heated debate arose Saturday around the draft rules of the party. A total of four variants were submitted to the congress with two of them—from Moscow and Leningrad—evoking most of the arguments. The Leningrad draft is more democratic—it envisages no fixed membership of the party and grants local organisations the right to disagree with the centre's decisions and not to implement them. The Moscow variant favours strict principles of democratic centralism.

History is apparently repeating itself. Just like at the second congress of the Russian Social Democratic Workers' Party, delegates to the present forum split into Mensheviki (backing the Leningrad platform) and Bolsheviki (favouring the Moscow variant).

The congress has set up an editing commission to work out new, compromise draft rules. But many delegates believe that the Leningrad and Moscow points of view

are like poles apart and have little hope for a compromise solution acceptable to both factions.

Party Rules Adopted

LD0705061390 Moscow TASS in English 0601 GMT 7 May 90

[By TASS correspondent Lev Aksenov]

[Text] Moscow May 7 TASS—A Social Democratic Party of the Russian Federation was founded at the party's constituent congress which ended here late on Sunday night.

For three days more than 200 delegates representing 92 residential areas of Russia discussed the objectives of party's activities and statutory norms of the new party.

The congress was marked by impassioned debates. The discussion of the draft rules of the party was especially heated. In all, there were four drafts, but the main argument developed between the supporters of the Leningrad and Moscow versions.

Leningraders advocated giving up a fixed membership and the granting of the right to local organisations not to observe the decisions of the centre, while Muscovites supported democratic centralism and individual membership of the Social Democratic Party of the Russian Federation.

Only after intensive work did the conference-and-drafting commission succeed in working out a new compromise version, adopting as its basis the Moscow draft with a number of provisions taken from Leningrad document.

The discussion of this version occupied the majority of the session on Sunday. But complete unity was not achieved: Several Leningrad Social Democrats walked out of the hall after the party rules were adopted.

Nikolay Tutov, a member of the USSR Supreme Soviet, referred to the congress as a "major political event in the life of the Russian Federation". At the same time USSR People's Deputy Valentin Davituliani believes that the delegates "were drowned in minor issues".

Those present were addressed in speeches of greetings by David Blackman, deputy general secretary of the socialist group of the European Parliament, as well as by a spokesman for the Austrian socialist party, who attended the congress as guests.

The congress ended with the formation of the party's leading bodies. The delegates elected a 40-member board of the party out of 85 candidacies suggested.

A presidium of the board was elected from among the board members. The presidium includes Aleksandr Obolensky, a USSR people's deputy; Oleg Rumyantsev, a people's deputy of the Russian Federation; and Pavel Kudyukin, a historian from Moscow.

The delegates also elected a control-and-auditing commission of the party. A regular congress of the Social Democratic Party of the Russian Federation is to be held in autumn this year.

More on Congress

LD0605190990 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1800 GMT 6 May 90

[Text] The constituent congress of the Social Democratic Party of the Russian Federation has just ended its work in Moscow. This party today numbers more than 4,000 members. The congress elected three co-chairmen, confirmed its rules, elected a board, and resolved a number of other organizational matters. In all, 270 delegates were present at the congress, representing 84 towns of the Russian Federation, including 18 members of the CPSU and 51 USSR people's deputies, the Russian Federation, and local soviets. Also taking part in the work of the congress were representatives of social democratic parties from ten foreign countries, and even two representatives of the Social Democratic Workers' Party, which had existed in our country prior to 1917. In the view of USSR People's Deputy Nikolay Tutov, the social democrats are currently the most powerful and authoritative force in Europe. The party plans to enter into coalition with other organizations, and to stand in opposition; at the next elections of USSR people's deputies.

Moscow Soviet To Discuss City Status Draft Law

PM0305121590 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 3 May 90 Morning Edition p 1

[Interview with V. Palyutin, deputy chief of the Moscow Gorispolkom combined economic department, by our correspondent V. Zaykin; date and place of interview not stated; first paragraph is introduction]

[Text] The Moscow Gorispolkom [city soviet executive committee] and the Moscow CPSU Gorkom [city committee] have prepared a draft USSR Law "on the status of Moscow City." It will be discussed at a session of the Moscow Soviet. Our correspondent met with V. Palyutin, deputy chief of the Moscow Gorispolkom combined economic department.

[Zaykin] Vladimir Sergeyevich, why does Moscow need special status?

[Palyutin] Because Moscow is a special city. The capital of the country and the republic. The embassies of foreign states and their trade missions are here as are the missions of all the Union republics. There are 168 ministries and departments here and an enormous number of higher educational establishments and 20 percent of the country's entire scientific potential is concentrated here. The capital is a major cultural and industrial center. And today, only by possessing the right to make laws can the city authorities resolve the problems which have accumulated.

With the transition to economic accountability [khozraschet] enterprises are paying increasingly little attention to the city's needs. Wages are rising but there are fewer and fewer goods on the shelves. As a result, money circulation is being destabilized. The authorities do not have the levers to influence these and other adverse processes. There are a number of government resolutions on the withdrawal of nonspecialist and ecologically harmful production facilities. But the withdrawal is proceeding with extreme difficulties. What is to be done here? It is essential to give the city authorities the right to close such enterprises. But this should be enshrined in legislation.

Moscow needs its own tax system which would ensure that order is introduced in the city. For instance, today it is impossible to impose financial sanctions on enterprises for poor quality work (for instance, the repeated digging up of the capital's streets) or for failing to maintain cleanliness on the territories allocated to them.

[Zaykin] It is proposed that Moscow be given an absolutely special status and be invested with special rights. What rights?

[Palyutin] The capital needs socioeconomic sovereignty on the basis of a state formation within the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic system. That will give the right to make laws.

The future legislative act should regulate Moscow's relations with other regions of the country. The city's industry is linked to a considerable degree with the solution of all-Union tasks. At the same time the capital takes virtually no part in the production of agricultural products. That is why the present transition of the republics and other regions to economic accountability should not disrupt mutual commitments for deliveries of food and industrial goods.

Tyumen Oil Restricted to Contract Customers

LD0505142490 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1300 GMT 5 May 90

[Text] From now on the supply of oil from the Tyumen field will be based on direct contracts with consumers. The reason for this decision, taken by the local oblast executive committee, is the fact that in recent years the supply of oil products to citizens in Tyumen Oblast has deteriorated sharply, in spite of the fact that Tyumen accounts for two-thirds of the oil extracted throughout the USSR. Furthermore, supplies of food and industrial goods to the northern region from union republics are constantly breaking down. In order to rectify the situation and to tighten discipline in the two-way deliver of goods, the Tyumen oblast executive committee has decided that from next year onward, it will be necessary for supplies of oil and refined gas products to be based on direct deals and contracts with consumers, including Soyuznefteeksport, the all- union foreign trade organization responsible for the export of oil products. The new ruling applies to enterprises, krays, and oblasts alike.

Tomsk Nuclear Plant Blamed for Contamination

PM0405112290 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 4 May 90 Morning Edition p 6

[Own correspondent A. Solovyev report under the rubric "Urgent Warning": "Radioactive Waste Available to All"]

[Text] Tomsk—The people of Tomsk are getting agitated: Radioactive elks and hares are at large in the surrounding forests, and radioactive ducks and crayfish are in the streams and lakes. After examining 38 people who had eaten the flesh of wild animals and fish, doctors established that the level of radioactive substances in their organisms is higher than the permitted maximum. Seven people—four adults and three children—have been hospitalized.

The "incubator" of the radioactive birds and animals is known: the closed city of Tomsk-7 (it is also called Seversk). One of the USSR's first nuclear power stations [AES's] was built there in the early fifties. It supplies energy to the Siberian Chemicals Combine, which is also behind barbed wire, and supplies heat to agricultural complexes and housing.

Unfortunately, it does not only supply them, it also harms them. The more dilapidated the nuclear "old lady" becomes, the more capricious it grows. But not much is known about what happens behind the barbed wire—no reports are published about the AES except for assurances that everything is fine there.

In the first week of April some "Khimstroy" construction workers killed some hares. They themselves ate some hare meat, and they treated their wives and children. Others preferred fish....

On 18 April Tomsk-7 radio told the inhabitants: "Attention, radiation! Radioactive contamination of people has taken place in our city."

The author of the report was radio correspondent A. Grigoryev, by no means an unimportant character in this story; he used to work at the Siberian Chemicals Combine as senior engineer for monitoring stocktaking and storage of special output. His career ended when he discovered a vast quantity of radioactive output at the "plant" and raised the alarm, but at the time no one would listen to him. He wrote a letter to the Central Committee and L.I. Brezhnev. Grigoryev was reprimanded and threatened with expulsion from the party. But all the same, some measures were adopted.

Now times have changed. But although Grigoryev's first warning about radioactive animals went out on the radio—glasnost!—the second, more detailed, went unnoticed...

Workers S. Savin, V. Tekutyev, and their comrades are now sorry that they believed their bosses' assurances about the cleanness of the territory where they were working. The bosses, to justify themselves, blame the

construction workers for everything: They violated the rules governing fishing and shooting in a green zone.... The doctors are worried—the radioactive waste burial site is poorly fenced and wild animals running into it could (and do) carry radiation all over the area. Contaminated water areas are also open to everyone.

The complacency of the local authorities is striking: They appear not to realize that the situation is patently fraught with danger, that the worn-out AES could become a second Chernobyl. One must agree with Grigoryev and the other specialists from Tomsk-7: An independent and authoritative commission should answer the tough questions posed by the people of Tomsk.

Fire Breaks Out on Siberian Gas Pipeline

LD0705102290 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0935 GMT 7 May 90

[Text] Kurgan (Western Siberia) 7 May (TASS)—At 0500 Moscow Time [0100 GMT] this morning a fire broke out on the Urengoy-Surgut-Chelyabinsk gas pipeline, some 160 kilometers north of Kurgan in Western Siberia following a fracture to one of the strings of pipes. There are no casualties and there is no threat to nearby villages. The aftermath of the accident is being cleared up.

Ostakino TV Center To Increase Capabilites

LD3004012390 Moscow World Service in English 2100 GMT 29 Apr 90

[Text] Specialists at the Ostankino Television Center in Moscow have begun mounting equipment which is expected to notably increase the center's broadcasting potential.

Under contracts with firms in various parts of the world, Soviet television will for the first time ever launch commercial activity. The TV tower is 540 m high, and there are plans to mount another 30 m section on top of it which will again make the tower the world's tallest.

Western Republics

Plan To Decommission Chernobyl, Aid Victims

PM0105153390 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 28 Apr 90 Morning Edition p 2

["USSR Supreme Soviet Resolution on Integrated Program To Clear Up the Consequences of the Accident at the Chernobyl AES and the Situation Connected With the Accident"]

[Text] The USSR Supreme Soviet notes that the accident at the Chernobyl AES [nuclear electric power station] represents the greatest modern-day catastrophe in terms of its total consequences and is a nationwide disaster that has affected the lives of millions of people living in vast territories. The environmental impact of the Chernobyl catastrophe has confronted the country with the need to tackle new and extremely complex large-scale problems affecting virtually every sphere of social life and many aspects of science, production, culture, ethics, and morality.

Enormous resources and the efforts of leading scientists and specialists have been directed toward these ends, which has made it possible to prevent the catastrophic development of events connected with the accident and radiation damage to the population and to reduce the scale of environmental contamination.

The USSR Supreme Soviet stresses that the measures being taken to clear up the aftereffects of the accident have been insufficient. An extremely tense sociopolitical situation has developed in regions subjected to radioactive contamination because of contradictions in the recommendations of scientists and specialists on problems of radiation safety and delay in taking essential measures, with resultant loss of faith in local and central organs of power among some of the population. In-depth study of the postaccident situation and the development of a validated action program is proceeding slowly, which is causing legitimate outrage on the part of the inhabitants of the region which suffered radioactive exposure.

The elaboration of the long-term integrated State Union Republic Program To Eliminate the Consequences of the Accident at the Chernobyl AES has not yet been finalized, and the republic programs to eliminate the consequences of the accident in the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic], the Ukrainian SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic], and the Belorussian SSR need refinement. There is no general concept concerning safe conditions of habitation in contaminated territories acceptable to broad strata of the population—which complicates the sociopsychological situation and renders it impossible to implement adequately validated measures to protect the population of the affected regions. There is no full or detailed information available on the contamination of territory by radionuclides. Mistrust and protest on the population's part are generated by the provisional radiation dosage levels set for afflicted regions and the lack of provision of dosimetric and radiometric monitoring devices.

Tens of thousands of people living in zones of enhanced radiation have not yet been moved out. The construction of accommodation for evacuees is developing too slowly. The inhabitants of afflicted regions have not been fully provided with pure foodstuffs, essential goods, or appropriate medical services. Questions concerned with improving the health of the population, particularly children, are being tackled in an unsatisfactory way.

The large-scale decontamination of population centers is proving ineffective in many cases. Questions concerned with the reliable isolation of many sources of high radioactivity at the nuclear station industrial site and outside it have not been solved. Work is being carried

out on considerable areas of agricultural land contaminated by radionuclides without due regard for the emergency situation, which allows food contaminated in excess of the set norms to be produced and consumed and agricultural workers to be exposed to radiation. Essential acts of legislation governing the carrying out of agricultural work under conditions of radiation contamination are lacking.

The prevailing situation is in many respects the consequence of wrong assessments made at all levels of state management in the center and at local level regarding the scale and consequences of the Chernobyl AES accident as a truly global catastrophe, poorly coordinated action, an unwarranted monopoly on research, the classsifying of data on the radiation situation, particularly in 1986, a lack of knowledge on the part of the population, and the absence of a fully empowered state organ responsible for carrying out measures to protect the population from the consequences of the accident.

The country proved ill-prepared to comprehend the event in depth or to solve promptly its scientific, social, psychological, and legal problems, and this has had an adverse effect on the elaboration and implementation of the large-scale package of measures designed to eliminate the consequences of the Chernobyl AES accident.

The USSR Supreme Soviet resolves:

1. To ratify the State Union Republic Program of Urgent Measures for 1990-92 To Eliminate the Consequences of the Chernobyl AES Accident, which was developed on the basis of republic programs and proposals by the State Expert Commission and submitted by the USSR Council of Ministers, as the first stage in a long-term state program envisaging the phased relocation of people from territories subjected to enhanced radioactive contamination, where normal, unrestricted living and working conditions cannot be assured, particularly for families containing children or pregnant women, the enhancement of health protection, the improvement of the social and consumer sphere, and the supply of pure foodstuffs to the population, above all children, that has suffered as a result of the accident.

To provide a separate paragraph in the 1991-92 USSR and Union republic socioeconomic development plans for the appropriation of financial and material resources to those ends. To seek the necessary resources, material, and equipment to carry out additional urgent work in 1990 in the light of comments made by USSR people's deputies.

The USSR Council of Ministers, the RSFSR Council of Ministers, the Ukrainian SSR Council of Ministers, and the Belorussian SSR Council of Ministers are to report annually to the USSR Supreme Soviet on the implementation of the aforementioned measures.

2. To approve the RSFSR, Ukrainian SSR, and Belorussian SSR programs to eliminate the consequences of the Chernobyl AES accident. The RSFSR, Ukrainian SSR, and Belorussian SSR Councils of Ministers are to refine their programs in the light of the comments made by the USSR Gosplan [State Planning Committee] State Expert Commission and the proposals made by USSR people's deputies. The USSR Council of Ministers and the Councils of Ministers of the aforementioned Union repoublics are to take measures to execute the programs forthwith.

3. The USSR Council of Ministers, in conjunction with the RSFSR, Ukrainian SSR, and Belorussian SSR Councils of Ministers and with the involvement of leading Soviet and foreign specialists on this problem, is to complete the elaboration of the integrated long-term State Union Republic Program To Protect the Population of the USSR from the Impact of the Consequences of the Chernobyl Catastrophe and to ratify it by the end of 1990. The program is to be based on a humane concept of safe human habitation with prime consideration of the following aspects:

the fundamental improvement of medical service provision for the inhabitants, particularly children and juveniles, of the stricken regions, with medical personnel being recruited by advantageous contract terms;

the development and introduction of sorption methods of preventive work and dietary food available on prescription to prevent the buildup of radionuclides in the organism and accelerate their removal;

the improvement of the quality of the environment, the development of new approaches to lowering levels of radioactivity on contaminated territories, and prevention of the spread of radionuclides to new territories;

the development of a uniform state system of benefits and compensation for damage caused to the health of people who are living or have lived in contaminated territory, who are performing or have performed military service there, and also those who have been involved in clearing up the consequences of the accident; and the creation of a state register of those people;

the creation of an integrated radioenvironmental information system for all strata of the population, with extensive presentation of data on radiation contamination and healthcare and environmental statistics and the use of the opportunities afforded by the press, radio, and television; and the elimination of all secrecy in these questions.

4. To recommend to the USSR Council of Ministers that it set up a Committee on Eliminating the Consequences of the Chernobyl AES Accident and to recommend to the RSFSR and the Ukrainian SSR and Belorussian SSR Councils of Ministers that they set up appropriate committees in their republics, vesting them with the necessary authority to deal with this problem.

To deem it advisable to organize under this committee, in conjunction with the USSR, the Ukrainian SSR, and

the Belorussian SSR Academies of Sciences, a scientific coordination center to develop an integrated strategy for the measures under way.

5. The USSR Council of Ministers is to elaborate a draft Law on the Chernobyl Catastrophe and submit it to the USSR Supreme Soviet in the fourth quarter of 1990. The law is to define the legal status of the victims of the catastrophe, those involved in eliminating the consequences of the accident, people engaged in carrying out work in the stricken zone, and also those people subject to enforced resettlement, and also to define the legal conditions obtaining in the disaster zone, the procedure governing the population's life and work, and the procedure for performing military service and the formation and functioning of territorial organs of state management and social organizations in the stricken regions.

To submit to the USSR Supreme Soviet for examination by the fall session 1990 a draft Law on the Utilization of Nuclear Energy and on Nuclear Safety;

to elaborate before the end of 1990 a package of measures to decommission the Chernobyl AES power units and solve problems bound up with ensuring the social protection and rights of the station's workers and the nuclear and radiation safety of facilities in the electric power station zone and with the burial of radioactive waste and the safeguarding of the atmosphere and water souces from contamination by radionuclides;

to complete in 1990 the formation of scientifically based criteria concerning safe human habitation in the light of the no-threshold [besporogovyy] concept and other modern ideas;

to elaborate and ratify by September 1990 the special "Chernobyl Children" program on limiting and eliminating the impact of the adverse factors of the Chernobyl catastrophe on the coming generation in the light of all the social, environmental, and medical features of the problem;

to complete in 1991 the compilation of medium- and large-scale geographical, geochemical, and radioenvironmental survey maps of territory contaminated by radionuclides and the radiation certification of households in population centers located in the monitored zone;

to take measures to stop as rapidly as possible the production in contaminated territories of foodstuffs which do not meet the normatives. To step up state monitoring of the radionuclide content of agricultural products in zones subjected to radioactive contamination. To limit the use of chemical plant-protection agents in radiation-affected zones.

6. To urge the parliaments of all the countries of the world and international organizations to provide assistance in solving the problems of the Chernobyl catastrophe, including the creation of an international fund and scientific research center with the involvement of leading world specialists. The USSR Council of Ministers is, with the participation of public organizations, to determine measures which ensure conditions conducive to international cooperation and the coordination of international help.

Monitoring of the implementation of this resolution is vested in the USSR Supreme Soviet Committee for Questions of Ecology and the Rational Use of Natural Resources and the USSR Supreme Soviet Committee for the Protection of the People's Health.
[Signed] A. Lukyanov, chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet.
The Kremlin, Moscow, 25 April 1990.

Ceremonies Commemorating Chernobyl Disaster Noted

PM0105085790 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 28 Apr 90 Morning Edition p 2

[Feature comprising unattributed reports: "Chernobyl... Remembrance Day"]

[Text] The greatest modern-day catastrophe and nationwide disaster... That is how the accident at the Chernobyl AES [nuclear electric power station] was assessed by our parliament in a USSR Supreme Soviet resolution. The tragedy has affected the lives of millions of people. Considerable territory belonging to our country is located in the environmental disaster zone. The echo of the tragedy continues to reverberate painfully in our hearts.

April 26 is now a day of remembrance and grief...

Kiev. At noon on 26 April all the churches of Kiev and the eparchy rang their bells. The church was the first to speak, remembering in its prayers the victims of the nuclear catastrophe. Chernobyl Tragedy Day is being officially marked for the first time.

More than 1,000 population centers which have suffered radioactive contamination are officially recorded in the Ukraine. Around 1 million people live in them. K. Masik, chairman of the Ukrainian SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] Council of Ministers extraordinary standing commission, acknowledged the other day: "Although we receive quite a lot of help from the Union government, we will be unable to do everything needed to restore the environment and protect children from the pernicious consequences of the accident without the international community's help."

A large number of people gathered for the unprecedented all-Ukrainian prayer service for the victims of the Chernobyl tragedy held in front of St. Sofia's Cathedral in Kiev on the vast Bogdan Khmelnitskiy Square. A minute's silence was declared at 2000 hours. Traffic stopped and lights went out in the windows of the city with its population of 3 million. Thousands of candles were lit, in keeping with traditional custom....

Minsk. In Belorussia too this date was officially declared Chernobyl Tragedy Day. A fund-raising rally-cum-requiem took place in Minsk's Dinamo Stadium. Speakers expressed anxiety and grief concerning the very grave consequences of the catastrophe for the Belorussian people. More than 2 million people live in a zone where contamination is in excess of 1 curie per square kilometer.

It is reported that the Belorussian SSR Academy of Sciences has proposed that Belorussia be declared a national disaster zone. M. Tkachev, chairman of the Belorussian People's Front Council, has proposed that the republic become a nuclear-free zone. Yet another proposal is that a parliamentary commission be set up at the first session of the Belorussian SSR Supreme Soviet to investigate the actions of officials responsible for covering up the scale of the tragedy.

At a rally Metropolitan Filaret of Minsk and Grodnensk, patriarchal exarch of all Belorussia, delivered an address to all the Slav peoples. Candles were lighted when it grew dark...

Moscow. The main event of the day for Moscow was the fund-raising "Chernobyl" telethon, which started at 0000 hours on 26 April in the Rossiya movie and concert hall. It was televised by the all-Union Second Program for 24 hours.

The total sum of money donated into the accounts by the end of the telethon was R70,332,000 and $4,738,000. Not everything has yet been computed or converted. For example, medical equipment and medicine. Many foreign organizations have assumed the cost of treating patients. It costs R100,000 to treat one child suffering from leukemia abroad. It costs R100,000 to relocate one family from a radiation-affected zone.

The IZVESTIYA editorial office pledged R15,000 during the telethon.

Chernobyl Union Formed in Chernigov

90UN1555B Kiev PRAVDA UKRAINY in Russian 22 Mar 90 p 3

[Report by RATAU correspondent A. Oleynik: "With Concern for Chernobyl Sufferers"]

[Text] A constituent conference was held for the Chernigov Oblast organization of the Chernobyl Union. It approved a resolution which defines the tasks for protecting the rights of participants in the cleanup after the accident at the Chernobyl power plant and people living in the contaminated territory.

More than 100 population points in the oblast are now in the zone that requires periodic medical inspection. Almost 6,500 residents of the Chernigov area participated in the cleanup after the accident, and 750 families evacuated from the 30-meter zone live in the cities and rayons of the oblast. These people need not only permanent medical observation and a good supply of food but also the usual attention from the public. The Chernobyl Union was created in order to surround them with concern. It will operate in close contact with soviet, party, and trade union organs, and social organizations.

Ivashko on Ukrainian Withdrawal From Union

LD0405183190 Kiev RADYANSKA UKRAINA in Ukrainian 1 May 90

[Excerpts] V. Ivashko, CPSU Central Committee Politburo member, received on 29 April a group of Canada's parliamentarians, who were representing the three major parties. [passage omitted]

Replying to the guests' questions about the situation in the republic and its further development, V. Ivashko said that at the present stage noteworthy are the politization of life and the growth of national self-awareness of the people. As a result of reforms within the political system, new soviets have been elected democratically. Various views are being nurtured in society concerning the present and future. The lack of democratic tradition leads, at times, to acute situations. In these conditions the Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee tries to act evenly in order to keep the process within the framework of democracy and to avoid destabilization. The party will have to cover the rest of the road together with other political forces which pursue constructive aims. The past experiences testifies that such interaction in the solving of even very acute problems is possible.

The first secretary then dwelt on what is being done to achieve political and economic sovereignty of Ukraine. He noted in particular that the new union treaty will be founded on principles which will present broad possibilities for asserting the sovereignty of the republics within the Soviet federation. A withdrawal from the USSR, which is being urged by certain persons, does not correspond with the interests of the 52-million people of the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic.

Ivashko Has Meeting With Swedish Ambassador

LD0405120490 Kiev Domestic Service in Ukrainian 1745 GMT 3 May 90

[Text] Vladimir Ivashko, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and first secretary of the Ukrainian Communist Party [UCP] Central Committee, today received Orjan Berner, Sweden's ambassador in the USSR, at the latter's request.

In the friendly talk that ensued, Berner said he undertook the journey to Kiev in order to acquaint himself more closely with the life of the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic. At his request, Vladimir Ivashko outlined the political situation in the republic and reported on the results of the elections to the republic and local soviets.

Referring to some press articles, the ambassador asked Ivashko to enlighten him on the seriousness of the nationality question in the Ukraine. Comrade Ivashko

dwelled on the growing self-awariness of the people. The UCP Central Committee supports this process. Many problems have piled up in the republic since the 1920's and [words indistinct] existed as a unitary state. Mistakes were made in the nationality policy. Many citizens, including communists, fell victim to Stalinist repressions. At present, measures are being taken to develope the Ukrainian national culture and language, as well as the cultures and languages of other nationalities living in the Ukraine. It is important to arrive at concensuses in a society, especially when the solution of very difficult problems is undertaken. At the same time, we cannot come to terms with the manifestations of a nationalist and separatist character.

Considerable attention on both sides was paid to economic problems. Uladimir Ivashko gave a detailed account of the plans to switch over to supervised market economy and to broaden external economic relations. The host noted our interest in learning the experience of other countries, particularly that of Sweden, in insuring the protection of working people from market elements.

The ambassador then reported on the measures being taken by the Government of Sweden to bring down inflation and improve the taxation system. Also discussed were certain trends in the development of Ukrainian-Swedish cooperation.

Participating in the talk were Merkulov, head of the International Relations Department of the UCP Central Committee, and (Maslyuchenko), assistant to first secretary of the Central Committee.

Ukrainian Party Official Interviewed on May Day

LD0205183190 Kiev International Service in English 2330 GMT 1 May 90

[Text] May Day manifestations were held in Kiev. Veterans of the Communist Party and labor, World War II veterans, public representatives gathered near the monument to Vladimir Lenin. The leaders of the republic laid flowers at the monument to Lenin and paid tribute to the memory of the founder of Soviet state.

First secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Ukraine, Vladimir Ivashko, had a conversation with a group of Kievites. Radio Kiev interviewed Vladimir Ivashko after the holiday manifestation was over. Here's a recording of that interview:

[Begin Ivashko recording in Ukrainian with superimposed English translation] May Day is the holiday of the working people. It is the holiday of spring and solidarity of people. This is why I feel a holiday mood now, despite the fact that our society faces quite a few problems. However, the tradition of May Day celebrations, laid down a century ago by the working people, continue to live. The impressive manifestation was held by the people upon their own initiative and will, because they were eager to celebrate May Day. [end recording]

While touching upon the problems facing the society and ways to overcome them, Vladimir Ivashko said the following:

[Begin Ivashko recording] The main problem is to complete those economic reforms which have been launched in the republic. For this we need a concerted effort and consolidation of all working people. We must realize that we can distribute only that which has been produced. Living standards of people can only grow with the growth of the national income. There is every opportunity for this. The enterprises now have a free hand at establishing direct ties among themselves and with enterprises in other republics and foreign countries. All this should be used for the benefit of people. [end recording]

One Dead, 20 Injured in Ukraine Rail Crash

LD0505122190 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1100 GMT 5 May 90

[Text] We have received news of a rail accident from the TASS correspondent in Kiev.

At 1540 yesterday passenger train No. 222, en route between Lvov and Voroshilovgrad, crashed on the Grebenka-Romodan single-track section of the southern railway between the stations of Boyarskiy and Lazorki. The train was travelling at a speed of 94 km per hour. Ten railway coaches left the rails and five of them overturned. One person was killed and 20 were injured.

The casualties have been housed at treatment establishments in Orzhitsa Rayon and the town of Lubny in Poltava Oblast. The remaining passengers were taken to Poltava and sent on their way aboard a new train.

The movement of trains was restored on the section at 0312 today.

A commission to assist the casualties and to ascertain the causes of the accident has set about its work.

Belorussian Supreme Soviet Elections Reviewed

LD0605184690 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1500 GMT 6 May 90

[Summary] Leonid Petrovich Korabenko, of the Central Electoral Commission is interviewed on the preliminary results of the Belorussian Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR] Supreme Soviet elections. He says that repeat elections have taken place in 60 constituencies, but valid elections were not held in another 10. Twenty-nine Belorussian SSR peoples deputies were elected; runoffs will be held in 29 constituencies and repeat elections in 14 others. So far 317 of 360 Belorussian SSR people's deputies have been elected in the republic. 234 of those elected are CPSU members, but there are few workers, young people, or women. The first session of the Belorussian SSR Supreme Soviet is to take place on 15 May.

Moldavian-Romanian Cultural Event on Border

LD0705084190 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1730 GMT 6 May 90

[By TASS correspondent Vasiliy Abrekov]

[Text] Bucharest, 6 May (TASS)—Thousands of people from districts in Romania and population centers of the Moldavian Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR] met today on the Romanian-Soviet border within the framework of the "bridge of flowers over the Prut" venture, organized by the "Cultural League for the Unity of All Romanians" and the "Bucharest-Kishinev Cultural Association."

After public prayers and to the accompaniment of church bells, the participants in the festival threw flowers into the Prut from both shores, symbolizng a bridge over the river that divides Romania and the Moldavian SSR. The Romanian-Soviet border was then temporarily opened in the Albita area for citizens from both sides to cross it freely and without visas.

In an interview with a TASS correspondent, V. Krechin, one of the organizers of the venture and a representative of the "Cultural League for the Unity of All Romanians," said that the action pursued no political ends. Now that processes of renewal are underway in Romania and the USSR, many barriers on the way to communication between the residents of the border areas of the two countries are coming down.

People involved in culture, science, and the arts, and representatives of the clergy in both Romania and the USSR took part in this cultural event.

Komratskiy Rayon First Secretary Replaced

LD2204230190

[Editorial Report] Kishinev SOVETSKAYA MOLDAVIYA in Russian on 10 April publishes on page two a report noting that a 7 April plenum of the Komratskiy Rayon Party Committee [raykom] released S.V. Grozdev from his duties as raykom first secretary in connection with his transfer to other work. F.V. Manolov was elected to the vacant post.

Caucasus

Nagorno-Karabakh Situation 'Remains Tense'

LD0705081190 Baku Domestic Service in Azeri 0202 GMT 7 May 90

[Text] The situation remains tense in the Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast. At 2100 on 5 May, internal troops were fired at [words indistinct]. Four Armenians, who were among those who fired at the troops, were captured. A large amount of firearms and cold steel and [word indistinct] were seized from them. During the (?past) 24 hours, 21 people and 27 vehicles were detained and 15 people were administratively detained. In Stepanakert, 11 people were arrested. [passage indistinct]

Armed Group Attacks Yerevan Party Building

NC0605123290 Yerevan Domestic Service in Armenian 0500 GMT 6 May 90

[From the review of KHORHRDAYIN HAYASTAN]

[Text] The paper has published a report which says: At 1500 on 4 May, a group of armed individuals surrounded the building of the Yerevan City Party Committee. Claiming to be members of the so-called Army of Independence of the Armenian Republican Party and of the Armenian [word indistinct] Army, they demanded that the leaders of the city party committee [words indistinct] until [word indistinct] their demands.

Every effort to liberate the building and resume the normal functioning of the city party committee was in vain. The demands of the besiegers (?were examined), general agreement was reached about certain issues raised, and explanations were provided for other issues.

The leaders of the group were (?warned) that unless they lift the siege of the building firm measures would be taken. A [word indistinct] was held near the party building during which Asatryan, first secretary of Yerevan City Party Committee, and USSR People's Deputy [name indistinct] addressed the gathering.

The siege of the building was lifted at 2000 hours.

During the entire course of the incident the party, soviet, and legal bodies exercised restraint and prudence and by sensible action were able to prevent a possible [word indistinct].

Armenian Plenum To Discuss Weapons Incident

LD0505195890 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1500 GMT 5 May 90

[Report by correspondent Koryun Khumaryan from the Armenian Soviet Socialist Republic Communist Party Committee plenum held in Yerevan on 5 May—recorded]

[Text] Today's plenum of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Armenia was held against the background of unremitting sociopolitical tension in the republic. The agenda was packed, with four issues, none of which could be postponed. These were: the convocation of the next, the 29th Congress of the Communist Party of Armenia and the mounting of a report-back and election campaign in the republic's party organizations; the drafting of the Armenian Communist Party's program; the holding of elections to the 28th Congress of the CPSU; and last, the fourth question had to do with the incident that occurred yesterday, 4 May, in Yerevan, outside the building of the party city committee, when young armed people surrounded the building of the city

committee of the Communist Party and issued an ultimatum demanding an immediate response to a number of matters put forward by them. To be perfectly honest, I am intrigued as to why they selected the party city committee, for all the demands were addressed rather to the legislative body. For instance, the adoption of a law on multi-party status. Or the law on citizenship of the republic. Or postponing the elections to the republic parliament, scheduled for May.

The main thing, though, is how to square what, in terms of content, are essentially democratic demands with such a repugnant approach as armed threats. It should be said that there were calls at the plenum for the incident to be punished harshly, and for a show of force. But the republican leadership sensibly believes that force is not the best argument, and that a republic or a country which is moving towards a law-based state system cannot permit extremism on any side. And incidentally, it was dialogue between the republican leadership and the leaders of these formations—a dialogue conducted from principled, party positions—that removed the tension yesterday and prevented the bloodshed that there could have been, if only because all of this occurred in one of the busiest parts of the city. At the same time, as the plenum stressed unambiguously, yesterday's incident demonstrated that weapons in the possession of the populace for whatever reason should immediately either be handed in, or least confiscated. And issues relating to the security of the border and the populace should be dealt with by the republic's state bodies.

More on Plenum

NC0605121590 Yerevan Domestic Service in Armenian 0500 GMT 6 May 90

[From the review of KHORHRDAYIN HAYASTAN]

[Excerpts] A report has been published on the Armenian Communist Party Central Committee [CPCC] plenum held yesterday. Invited to attend the plenum were heads of the departments of the Armenian CPCC, first secretaries of city and rayon party committees, chairmen of the executive committees of the city and rayon soviet of people's deputies, republican ministers (?who are not) members of the Armenian CPCC and the auditing commission, chairmen of the state committees, the secretaries of large party grassroots organizations, directors of a number of industrial enterprises and higher educational institutes, trade union and Komsomol [All-Union Lenisist Communist Youth League] workers, Army servicemen, and representatives of mass media.

The plenum examined that the issue of convening the 29th Congress of the Armenian Communist Party and the holding of a report-back election campaign in the republic's party organizations. Vladimir Movsisyan, first secretary of the Armenian CPCC, delivered a report on this issue. A group of comrades held an exchange of views on the report.

The plenum decided to convene the 29th Congress of the Armenian Communist Party in Yerevan on 22 November 1990. The plenum passed a resolution in this regard which has been published in the paper.

The plenum also heard a report about the drafting of the program of the Armenian Communist Party. Movsisyan, first secretary of the Armenian CPCC, delivered a report on this issue. [passage omitted] The plenum endorsed the membership of the committee drafting the program and by-laws of the Armenian Communist Party.

The plenum heard a report by Oleg Lobov, second secretary of the Armenian CPCC, on the holding of elections for the delegation from the Armenian Communist Party to the 28th congress of the CPSU. The plenum passed a resolution on this issue.

The plenum also examined the issue of the incident which took place in Yerevan on 4 May 1990. Asatryan, first secretary of Yerevan city party committee, delivered a report on this matter. A group of comrades participated in an exchange of views. The plenum took cognizance of the report submitted by the Yerevan City Party Committee and instructed the Armenian CPCC to take urgent and resolute measure to normalize the situation in the republic and in the capital and to strengthen law and order.

Movsisyan, first secretary of the Armenian CPCC, made a concluding speech at the plenum.

Militia Attacked; Arms, Ammunition Stolen

PM0605174990 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 6 May 90 First Edition p 4

[Untitled own correspondent report]

[Text] On the night of 1-2 May an attack was carried out on the militarized guard of the internal affairs line detachment at Masis Railroad Station. Three pistols, eight rifles, and as many as 50 cartridges were stolen. An attack took place in Yerevan the same night on two members of the militia: Two pistols and ammuniiton were stolen from them. On 4 May a group of bandits carried out a daring attack on the Ashtarakskiy Rayon Internal Affairs Department and seized 15 pistols and several dozen cylinders of "cheremukha."

On 4 May in the capital a group of armed militants took over the buildings of the Armenian Communist Party City Committee and the republic Komsomol [All-Union Leninist Communist Youth League] Central Committee and held them for several hours.

Report on Armenian Supreme Soviet Session

NC0405140590 Yerevan Domestic Service in Armenian 1630 GMT 3 May 90

[Report from the 12th extraordinary session of the 11th convocation of the Supreme Soviet of the Armenian Soviet Socialist Republic held at the Shaumyan Congress Hall in Yerevan on 3 May]

[Excerpts] This morning the session continued to debate the situation prevailing in the Armenian republic and in Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast [NKAO] and the question of resolving it.

The session, which was chaired by Suren Avedisyan, first deputy chairman of the republic's Supreme Soviet Presidium, commenced its deliberations by hearing a number of reports. Kerasim Martirosyan and Rafayel Kazaryan, deputies of the republic's Supreme Soviet, and USSR People's Deputy Zori Balayan then addressed the session.

At the previous session of the Supreme Soviet several deputies had proposed that Grant Voskanyan be relieved of his post as chairman of the republic's Supreme Soviet Presidium and a new chairman elected. Vladimir Movsisyan, first secretary of the Armenian Communist Party Central Committee, addressed the session on this issue. He said that in view of the fact that the elections for the republic's Supreme Soviet are at hand and that Comrade Voskanyan will be back at his post within a few days this issue should be resolved in the next session. This proposal was endorsed.

In addition, Comrade Movsisyan proposed that the issue of the election of the republic's president should also be debated in the next session. Movsisyan noted: As regards the definition of the status of the president, I propose to instruct the republic's Supreme Soviet Presidium, working with its commissions, to prepare proposals within five days and present them for examination by the extraordinary session. In this way we may define the status of the president, establish the procedure and date for the presidential election, and introduce relevant amendments into the republic's Constitution. Deputy Movsisyan then proposed to hold a direct presidential election, saying that the people and not the Supreme Soviet should elect the president. Deputy Movsisyan also proposed that the presidential election should be held within the next two months. This proposal was endorsed too.

Deputy Khrachik Simonyan, chairman of the commission preparing the draft resolution of the Supreme Soviet on the situation prevailing in the Armenian republic and the NKAO and the question of resolving it, read out the draft resolution as follows:

[Begin Simonyan recording] Everything is being done to present the just democratic movement of the Armenian people to the Soviet and world public opinion as a struggle directed against the policy of restructuring. Apparently, the authorities are of the opinion that because of Soviet Armenia's geopolitical situation, the Armenian people have no other alternative but to bow to oppression, give in to military pressures, patiently bear all the blows, and reconcile themselves to having their national dignity trampled on.

A reminder is necessary that the present situation prevailing in the region stems directly from the predatory Russian-Turkish treaty signed behind the backs of the Armenian people in 1921 and from the illegal decision of the Russian Communist Bolshevik Party's Caucasian Bureau. As a result of these, the Armenian republic was partitioned and more than 80 percent of the land historically part of Armenia was wrested away from the Armenian people.

However, efforts to suppress the will of the Armenian people and break it by violence are in vain. (?The Armenian people) will no longer reconcile themselves to this situation of partition in which they find themselves; they will no longer reconcile themselves to colonial oppression and exploitation.

The Supreme Soviet of the Armenian Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR], expressing the unanimous will of the people of Soviet Armenia and Artsakh [NKAO], appeals to the president of the USSR:

First: To lift the state of emergency in the NKAO; to withdraw the Army units of the Internal Affairs Ministry from NKAO territory and deploy them in the demarcation zones in the adjacent border regions of the oblast and the Azerbaijan SSR.

Second: To implement the decision of the NKAO soviet to restore the powers of the oblast soviet bodies.

Third: Immediately to declare null and void the unconstitutional and intrinsically provocative decree of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the Azerbaijan SSR of 21 April 1990. The aim of this decree is to alter the demographic situation of the NKAO and prevent the oblast's Armenian population from implementing its right to self-determination. To eliminate the consequences of the illegal acts taken by the Azerbaijani side so far.

Fourth: In compliance with various decisions made by the Second Congress of USSR People's Deputies and the USSR Supreme Soviet on the lifting of the blockade of the NKAO, to ensure free communication between the oblast and the Armenian SSR through the Goris-Lachin-Stepanakert road so as to prevent any possible arbitrary and undesirable acts aimed against the opening of the road.

Fifth: The Supreme Soviet of the Armenian SSR reiterates resolutely that the implementation of the principle of national self-determination in accordance with the Constitution of the country and the norms of international law forms the basis for the solution of the problem of the NKAO and the adjacent Armenian-inhabited Shaumyanovskiy Rayon and Getashen Subrayon.

Sixth: The Supreme Soviet of the Armenian SSR expresses its resolute protest at the fact that the USSR Supreme Soviet continues to ignore the 22 November 1988 decision of the Supreme Soviet of the Armenian SSR on the condemnation of the genocide of the Armenians in the Ottoman Empire in 1915. This attitude led to new illegal acts in Stepanakert on 24 April 1990, the day of commemoration of the victims of the major

genocide, in the form of oppression committed by the Army against the participants in the mourning ceremonies and in the form of a new display of violation of our national dignity on the great mourning day of the Armenian people.

The Supreme Soviet of the Armenian SSR declares that the Armenian people as a whole, both within the country and in the diaspora, are full of resolve to protect their national rights, defend their honor and dignity, and struggle to the end for the realization of right of self-determination for the NKAO and the 1 December 1989 joint decision of the Armenian Supreme Soviet and NKAO National Council.

In case of failure to introduce the measures asked for in this appeal, the entire responsibility for the further complication of the situation will fall on the central authorities and on the USSR president personally. [end recording]

USSR People's Deputies Lyudmila Arutyunyan, Sero Khanzadyan, and Genrikh Igityan; Khachik Stamboltsyan and Ashot Manucharyan, deputies at the republic's Supreme Soviet; and others made suggestions concerning the draft decision. Following their criticisms and suggestions, the session unanimously passed the resolution. [passage omitted]

Sarkis Khachaturyan, chairman of the republic's Supreme Soviet Legislative Commission, read out draft resolutions calling for the formation of a defense council and for absolving the Army draftees, who felt compelled to leave their Armed Forces units, from criminal prosecution and enabling them to continue their service in the territory of Armenia. Both drafts were endorsed by the session.

Following that, Deputy Sarkis Khachaturyan published a third draft.

[Begin Khachaturyan recording] The Supreme Soviet of the Armenian SSR resolves:

Temporarily to call off the 1990 spring conscription in the Armenian SSR.

The Supreme Soviet of the Armenian SSR notes that, since the day of the formation of the USSR, the Armenian republic has consistently fulfilled the responsibilities it has assumed, including those in the sphere of the defense of the USSR. Despite that, for the last two years the governing bodies of the USSR have been pursuing a policy clearly incompatible with the legal interests of the Armenian people, which has also resulted in the open display of oppression and national discrimination against Armenian servicemen in the Soviet Army.

The Supreme Soviet of the Armenian SSR also notes that its 29 June and 17 September 1989 appeals to the USSR Supreme Soviet and USSR Defense Ministry have remained without effect and no guarantees have been created for the personal security and protection of the national dignity of Armenian servicemen in the Soviet Army units.

The Supreme Soviet of the Armenian SSR also notes that for the last two years the infringements on the national security of the Armenian people in the Azerbaijan SSR, which have even culminated in genocide and forced mass deportations, have not been prevented by the Soviet central authorities. Rather, Soviet Army and internal troops units have often been used against the just national and democratic movement of the Armenian population. The Armenian people cannot but regard all these as an open manifestation of hostility toward the legal interests of the Armenian people and as a gross violation by the central authorities of their responsibilities toward the Armenian SSR.

Proceeding from the aforesaid circumstances, the Supreme Soviet of the Armenian SSR decides:

First: In line with article 75 of the Armenian SSR Constitution, to partially suspend the 29 March 1990 decision of the USSR Council of Ministers on the spring conscription for service outside the republic until a final solution of this issue is worked out with the USSR central authorities.

Second: This decision goes into effect from the day of its endorsement. [end recording]

There was an exchange of views on this draft resolution. A commission was set up to make a fundamental study of this problem and present its findings to the next session.

The 12th extraordinary session of the 11th convocation of the Supreme Soviet of the Armenian SSR then ended its deliberations.

Spring Draft Suspended

NC0605141590 Yerevan ARMENPRES International Service in Armenian 1215 GMT 4 May 90

[Excerpts] Yerevan, 4 May (ARMENPRES)—The 12th extraordinary session of the 11th convocation of the Supreme Soviet of the Armenian Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR] continued its deliberations on 3 May. [passage omitted]

Prompted by the existing situation, the Armenian SSR Supreme Soviet decided to set up a defense council attached to the Supreme Soviet. The Supreme Soviet also passed a decision on the future service duties of Armenian servicemen who felt compelled to abandon their Soviet Army units.

Because there are clear signs of discrimination against Armenian servicemen in the Soviet Army on nationalist grounds, often with tragic results, the Supreme Soviet decided to create a commission which would conduct the relevant studies and formulate the necessary measures.

With this objective in mind, it decided to temporarily suspend the spring 1990 conscription in the republic.

The Armenian SSR Supreme Soviet appealed to the USSR procurator general regarding the violation of the dignity of the Armenian people, the unfounded detention of innocent people, the artificial provocation of interethnic relations, and the disregard for the sovereign rights of the Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast and intervention in its internal affairs. It appealed to the procurator to investigate these matters and bring the culprits to account.

In a cable to the chairman of the USSR Supreme Court, the Armenian SSR Supreme Soviet requested that the trial of a group of Armenian young men on criminal charges not be transferred from Voronezh to Baku because the Supreme Court cannot ensure the safety of the detainees. To hold the trial in Baku might exacerbate interethnic relations in the region.

Issues related to the registration of Arkadiy Manucharov and Paruyr Ayrikyan as candidate deputies for the Armenian SSR Supreme Soviet were also raised during the session.

Border Area Discussed

PM0405142390 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 4 May 90 Second Edition p 7

[ARMENPRESS-TASS report under general heading "Sessions Held"]

[Text] Yerevan, 3 May—After the May Day holiday recess, the extraordinary session of the Armenian SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] Supreme Soviet resumed in Yerevan today. As reported earlier, it was convened because of the exacerbation of the situation in the Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast and the search for acceptable ways to normalize it. Having heard a report by the republic Ministry of Internal Affairs, deputies pointed out during the debate serious shortcomings in law enforcement organs' work, especially in putting a stop to all sorts of provocations in border areas. At the same time the population is not provided with exhaustive information on what is happening in these areas and this frequently leads to the spread of false rumors.

There were also quite a few arguments during the discussion of a question raised by a group of deputies—the spring draft of youths from Armenia into the ranks of the Soviet Army. In the opinion of the deputies it could be suspended and the young men dispatched to the disaster zone to do construction work instead of their military service. This proposal received backing.

The session has ended.

General Criticizes Armenian Decision on Draftees

PM0605174190 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 6 May 90 First Edition p 4

[Report by Lieutenant Colonel V. Kaushanskiy, KRASNAYA ZVEZDA correspondent: "Armenia: Unlawful Decision"]

[Text] The turbulent debates at the extraordinary Armenian SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] Supreme Soviet session had not even finished when the Transcaucasus Military District Headquarters was inundated with telephone calls, mainly from military commissariat officials. How were they to interpret the session's unilateral decision to leave draftees from Armenia to do military service at home, in the earthquake zone? Just how lawful was this decision? Perhaps the relevant articles of the Constitution, the Law on Universal Military Service, or the recent USSR Council of Ministers resolution had been abolished? I asked Lieutenant General Yu. Kuznetsov, first deputy commander of the Transcaucasus Military District, to give his opinion on these questions:

"To be frank, the act is unlawful, unconstitutional, and at variance with the latest government documents. There is no doubt that the session took its decision under powerful pressure from forces fueling tension in the republic and whipping up anti-Army feeling. One can only be amazed at the unusually docile commentary by Central Television, which presented the session's decision virtually to the accompaniment of approving applause: The young men will be sent to the earthquake zone, they said. I am perfectly well aware how a similar experiment ended last year. Twenty-five percent of draftees from Armenia who were left to carry out restoration work in construction subunits not only avoided this work but most of them fled to their homes. Dozens of officers had to look for them and return them to their place of service. I am talking about the most flagrant violation of military discipline. It is one more reason why I consider the decision of the extraordinary Armenian SSR Supreme Soviet session to be irresponsible."

Transcaucasus Railways Returning to Normal

LD3004183190 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1700 GMT 30 Apr 90

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] A report from the Transcaucasus. After a gap of one month, passenger trains have resumed running to Nakhichevan. The first of these, linking Baku and Norashen arrived in the capital of the autonomous republic this morning. Trains are running to schedule. To ensure the safe transportation of passengers along the Megri section of the railway, the trains are travelling accompanied by servicemen. With their assistance, the running of freight trains has been brought under control and the safe working of engine drivers has been ensured.

Strikers Force Railway Chief's Resignation

LD0605220290 Tbilisi ZARYA VOSTOKA in Russian 24 Apr 90 p 3

["Warning Strike Held on Transcaucasus Railway on 20 April"]

[Text] Freight traffic was halted on the Samtredia and Tbilisi lines. Passenger trains ran normally.

The protest action was held in the lobby of the Transcaucasus Railway Directorate. Up to 30 people went on a 24-hour hunger strike. The protest was organized by the Georgian People's Front and the protesters' main demand was the resignation of Viktor Blazhiyevskiy, the railway's chief.

As a member of the Georgian Supreme Soviet Presidium he was one of the 11 who approved the 9 April 1989 Protocol 37 of sad renown, which sanctioned the introduction of a curfew in Tbilisi.

The People's Front has long been demanding the resignation of the railway chief who had compromised himself. Unfortunately, no reply had been received to detailed telegrams to the government, the last of which was dated 16 April 1990. These telegrams said if there were no reaction by 20 April, the collective of the Transcaucasus railway would be forced to take strike action. The reaction came late and on that very day Beglar Makharashvili, deputy chairman of the republic's Council of Ministers, began talks with representatives of the People's Front, with the railway already paralyzed. The demands put forward by the protesters were as follows:

1. That Viktor Blazhiyevskiy be released from his post and made to face responsibility for his action.

2. That the question of his recall from the Georgian Supreme Soviet be urgently raised.

3. That a competent commission to formulate a concept for an independent Georgian railway be set up as a matter of urgency and, arising from this, that cadres policy be radically changed.

4. We demand the deideologization of the railway.

The talks lasted for around three hours. When Viktor Blazhiyevskiy left the room where they took place his last words were: "I shall go!" However, he declined to give an interview to the paper or to make any comment on what occurred.

Zurab Mamulashvili, chairman of the board of the People's Front at the Transcaucasus Railway Directorate said the protest should in no way be seen as being directed against a "Russian boss." In this instance nationality is of no significance. He also noted that Viktor Blazhiyevskiy himself understands this and acknowledged it during the talks. However, the railway chief could not refute the accusations against him and realized that after 9 April he could not work with the collective, concluded Zurab Mamulashvili.

All the strikers' demands were accepted in principle. Disagreement remained only on regarding the way they are to be satisfied and when. The strike ended on the same day at 1600 hours. The talks are to be continued.

One circumstance is particularly noteworthy: the pre-congress party conference has already been held at the Transcaucasus Railway Directorate. The issues on the minds of the protesters were not raised or examined at it.

Central Asia

Turkmen Foreign Ministry Activities Examined

LD0205220590 Ashkhabad Domestic Service in Russian 1430 GMT 11 Apr 90

[Excerpts] The Foreign Affairs Committee of the Supreme Soviet of the Turkmen Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR] has examined the question of the activities of the Foreign Ministry of the Turkmen SSR in organizing and implementing Soviet foreign policy. A report was delivered by Turkmen SSR Deputy Foreign Minister Rakhmanov.

It was noted that perestroyka, having put forward as one of the most important tasks the implementation of the sovereignty of the Turkmen SSR in the sphere of foreign relations, at the same time creates fundamentally new conditions for the development of international ties and cooperation. In order to ensure fulfillment of the foreign policy tasks facing the Turkmen SSR and of the USSR in the new conditions, the Turkmen SSR Foreign Ministry is restructuring all aspects of its activities and is taking specific steps to raise the level of activity and effectiveness of the republican diplomatic service, to restructure the forms and methods of work of the diplomatic apparatus, and to improve its internal structure. The statute regarding the Foreign Ministry of the Turkmen SSR has been adopted: this is the legal foundation of this foreign policy department's activities. [passage omitted]

At the same time, the measures which are being taking by the ministry have so far not led to a radical improvement in all areas of its work, to a renewal of its style and methods in line with the demands of the time.

Deputies Tuvakov, Zhurmenek, Zhadan, and others submitted a number of proposals to further develop the Turkmen SSR's foreign ties at various levels, to enhance their effectiveness and harmonize republican and public [Ashkabad TURKMENSKAYA ISKRA in Russian on 13 April 1990, page 1, reads: ...Harmonize republican and all-Union...] interests in this sphere.

The deputies stressed that it is necessary for the ministry more actively to get to the heart of republican organizations' foreign economic activities, to assist in establishing and developing direct ties with foreign partners, to plan and implement the Turkmen SSR's international

cultural ties in a purposeful way, and to give the necessary practical aid to the section for work with compatriots abroad of the Society of Friendship and Cultural Ties with foreign countries.

Proceeding from the important role of popular diplomacy in establishing an atmosphere of trust, in filling international relations with a moral and humanistic content, assistance to Turkmen SSR public organizations in expanding their international ties should be stepped up.

Deputy chairman of the Turkmen SSR Council of Ministers and Turkmen SSR Foreign Minister Amangeldyyeva provided explanations and additional information on the matter in question.

An appropriate decision was adopted on the matter examined. [passage omitted on work done in other Turkmen SSR Supreme Soviet committees]

Rybazov Dismissed From Turkmenistan Committee

LD0205195590 Ashkhabad SOVET TURKMENISTANY in Turkmen 26 Apr 90

[Excerpts] On 25 April the 18th plenum of the Communist Party of Turkmenistan Central Committee was held. [passage omitted]

The plenum examined an organizational matter. The plenum dismissed Ye. G. Rybalov from the Communist Party of Turkmenistan Central Committee for his incorrect behavior and his tendentious assessment of the activity of the Communist Party of Turkmenistan Central Committee, which was incompatible with the title of member of the Communist Party of Turkmenistan Central Committee. [passage omitted]

Yu.A. Tomak, a senior official of the apparatus of the CPSU Central Committee participated in the work of the plenum.

No-Show by Soccer Team Sparks Andizhan Riots

PM0405150190 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 4 May 90 Second Edition p 8

[Dispatch by ANDIZHANSKAYA PRAVDA journalist and L. Orlov, PRAVDA freelance correspondent P. Volkov under the rubric "From the Scene of Events": "Disturbances in Andizhan"]

[Text] Andizhan, 3 May—In the evening and during the night of 2-3 May major disturbances took place in Andizhan. The ancient Uzbek city became the scene of outrages, arson, pogroms, and looting.

It all began at the "Spartak" Stadium, where a friendly soccer match between the local team and Tashkent's "Pakhtakor" Club, eagerly awaited by the fans, was scheduled to take place at 1500 hours. After the match a sports and material prize raffle was to have been held. Some 10,000 people were gathered in the stadium that hot day when temperatures rose to summer levels.

According to Sh. Isakov, president of the economically accountable "Spartak" Soccer Club, less than an hour before the beginning of the match it became obvious that despite the signed contract the "Pakhtakor" Club was going to default. The fans were told that the raffle would be held and that the entrance tickets which they had bought would be valid for the next scheduled match. Members of the raffle commission tried to get on with their job, but they came under a hail of stones as people invaded the pitch. The club chairman was beaten up. The prize "Zhiguli" cars and two militia cars were set alight, and the stadium was vandalized. The law enforcement organs did not manage to get the situation under control and some militia workers were brutally beaten up.

Gangs of youth, meeting no proper rebuff, set light to and plundered dozens of houses.

According to preliminary information, 13 stores and 46 workshops were burned down in the city and three stores were looted. Eighteen institutions, libraries, and other establishments were vandalized. There are casualties; 44 people sought medical assistance and 13 people have been hospitalized, two of them in serious condition. There are no dead. Economic damage runs into hundreds of thousands of rubles.

Party and soviet organs are taking steps to normalize the situation in the city. Internal troop subunits have arrived in Andizhan to maintain order.

M.I. Ibragimov, chairman of the Uzbek SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] Supreme Soviet, and republic ministers are in the oblast.

The Andizhan People's Court has issued writs for the arrest for periods ranging between 10 and 15 days of seven lawbreakers who took part in the disturbances. In respect of other participants in the pogroms and fires, prosecutor's office organs have instituted criminal proceedings in nine cases.

Rain, Mud Slides Cause Damage in Tajikistan

LD0405210490 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1430 GMT 4 May 90

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Summary] M. Nikulin reports from the Lenin collective farm in Tajikistan's Tursunzadevskiy Rayon, where a mud slide caused by a downpour of rain has destroyed almost 2,500 hectares of crops. Some 250 houses have been hit, 50 of which are beyond repair. Schools, kindergartens, and other buildings have been damaged. Fortunately, there have been no casualties.

Voseyskiy Rayon has also been hit: more than 200 collectives farmers' plots have been wiped out by mud slides. Fruit trees and power lines have been brought down.

The total cost over the two rayons, according to preliminary calculations, amounts to more than R20 million. A government commission is working in the republic to deal with the aftermath of the disasters. Meanwhile, tents and building materials are being brought to the farms. Communications and power lines are being repaired. [video shows ruined houses; distraught man; mud- covered land]

List of Tajik Council of Ministers Published

LD0605181890

[Editorial Report] Dushanbe KOMMUNIST TADZHIKISTANA in Russian on 24 April publishes on page one a 1500-word decision by the Tajik Soviet Socialist Republic Supreme Soviet approving the Tajik Soviet Socialist Republic Council of Ministers. The decision lists the Council of Ministers and is accompanied by their photographs. The Council of Ministers is as follows:

Chairman	Khayeyev, Izatullo
First Deputy Chairmen	Koshlakov, Georgiy Vadimovich
	Vakhidov, Vakhob Vakhidovich
	Nazarov, Talbak
Deputy Chairmen	Zatsarinnyy, Yuriy Petrovich
	Latifi, Otakhon
	Samadov, Abduzhalil Akhadovich
	Muravyev, Gennadiy Fedorovich
Minister of Motor Transport	Yakubov, Nariman Kholovich
Minister of Internal Affairs	Navzhuvanov, Mamadaez
Minister of Housing and Municipal Service	Kostarev, Yuriy Borisovich
Minister of Health	Inomov, Dzhura Inomovich
Minister of Foreign Affairs	Kayumov, Lakim Kayumovich
Minister of Culture	Abdushukurova, Tamara Maksumovna
Minister of Light Industry	Kalandarov, Sharif Kalandarovich
Minister of Local Industry	Baymatov, Abdukhakim Baymatovich
Minister of Land Reclamation and Water Resources	Nurov, Akhtam Nurovich
Minister of Public Education	Davlatov, Ismoil
Minister of Communications	Usmanov, Ibragim Usmanovich
Minister of Rural Construction	Gafurov, Rakhimdzhon Gafurovich
Minister of Social Security	Kasymova, Adolat Temurovna
Minister of Highway Construction and Maintenance	Khalimov, Abdukhakim
Minister of Construction	Ponosov, Yuriy Filimonovich
Minister of Trade	Katayev, Opakhon Katayevich
Minister of Finance	Lafizov, Dzhanobiddin Lafizovich
Minister of Breadgrain Products	Abdullodzhanov, Abdumalik
	Abdullayevich
Minister of Justice	Abdulloyev, Fayzullo
Gosplan [State Planning Committee] Chairman	Nazarov, Talbak
Chairman State Agroindustrial Committee	Babayev, Akmal Maksumovich
Chairman State Committee for Construction and Architecture	Abdullayev, Tursunboy
	Abdullayevich
Chairman State Committee for Material and Technical Supply	Ashurov, Sergo Shermatovich
Chairman State Committee for Supervision of Safe Working Practices in Industry and for Mine Supervision	Malygin, Vadim Ilich
Chairman State Committees for the Supply of Petroleum Products	Makhmudov, Khudoykul
Chairman State Committee for Protection of the Environment	Nazriyev, Manavvar Nazriyevich
Chairman State Committee for the Press	Makhmadov, Bobokhon Aliyevich
Chairman State Committee for Cadre Training	Zukhurov, Shukurdzhon
Chairman State Committee for Statistics	Karimov, Ismatullo Khamidovich
Chairman State Committee for Television and Radio Broadcasting	Dzhurayev, Akbar Shadmonovich
Chairman State Committee for Labour and Social Problems	Shakarimov, Yuldash
	Abdukarimovich
Chairman State Committee for Physical Culture and Sports	Khasanov, Ibragim Rizoyevich
KGB Chairman	Petkel, Vladimir Viktorovich
Council of Ministers Charge d'Affaires	Makhkambayev, Salimdzhan

The decision is signed by K. Makhkamov, chairman of the Tajik Soviet Socialist Republic Supreme Soviet and dated 21 April 1990, Dushanbe.

Kazakhstan Expands Cooperation With Japanese Firm

LD0505031290 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 2130 GMT 4 May 90

[Text] News from Tashkent indictates cooperation is expanding. Closer cooperation has emerged from intermittent deals between Uzbekistan's foreign trading organizations and the Japanese firm Chori. A representation of the firm has opened in the capital of the republic. The prospects for cooperation are fairly extensive. The Soviet side is attracted by the firm's experience in developing machinery and technology for processing silk cocoons and is also interested in Chori's progressive sewing equipment. The partners are also considering the possibility of organizing an enterprise to produce denim and to manufacture denim clothes in Kokanda.

Peace Committee Urges Closure of Test Site

LD2604223390 Moscow TASS in English 1833 GMT 26 Apr 90

[Text] Moscow April 26 TASS—The Soviet Peace Committee has urged the Soviet Union's Government to close down the Semipalatinsk nuclear test site.

In an address to the government, the Committee says that "members of the general public of Semipalatinsk region, concerned over the situation taking shape around the test site where nuclear detonations were carried out for many years, appeal to the committee.

"The government's unfulfilled promise to consider the future of the test site in the first quarter of this year is giving rise to concern and bewilderment among the region's 850,000 residents.

"The efforts being taken by various organisations, including the Peace Committee, and aimed at rendering assistance to the population and at removing the strain are turning out to be clearly inadequate.

"What is required is a comprehensive long-term programme to eliminate the aftermath of operations at the Semipalatinsk test site, including a solution of specific issues connected with improving the health of people who were exposed to radiation, building medical institutions and fitting them out with up-to-date equipment and medicines.

"No detonations are currently carried out there. But this has not removed the strain. Conducting nuclear tests in a densely populated locality seems inhumane to us," the address says.

"The peace committee is calling on the Soviet Government to respond to applications coming in from all over multi-ethnic Kazakhstan and to take a decision to immediately close down the Semipalatinsk nuclear test site,' the address emphasises.

The people's deputies from the Soviet Peace Committee have been given a mandate to support this address with their energetic actions and to put an item concerning the Semipalatinsk nuclear test site on the agenda of a regular session of the USSR Supreme Soviet.

Nazarbayev Attends Kazakhstan Party Conference

LD0405201690 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1300 GMT 4 May 90

[Text] The communists of North Kazakhstan Oblast gathered at an oblast party conference in Petropavlovsk today. The main item on the agenda is discussion of programs for the deepening of perestroyka in the social sphere, ideological work, improving the economy, and the improvement of interethnic relations, which have been worked out and are due to be fulfilled in the oblast. These included the development of small villages, the development of the network of schools for children of indigenous and small ethnic groups living on the oblast's territory, and a program for the social cares of the family. Among these and other questions are the use of conversion by a number of enterprises for supplying the market with consumer goods.

Nazarbayev, president of the Kazakh Soviet Socialist Republic, is taking part in the conference's work.

Floods Damage Guryev Area; Kill Livestock

LD0505220290 Moscow Television Service in Russian 2100 GMT 5 May 90

[From the "Television News Service" program]

[Text] In the area of the town of Guryev, Kazakhstan, the Ural River and the Caspian Sea have raged on both sides of the town. About 40 houses have been seriously damaged and many head of cattle have been killed. Now the water level has somewhat fallen, but the meteorologists's forecasts are not optimistic.

Kazakh Oblast Conferences Elect Leaders

LD0705103690 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0900 GMT 7 May 90

[Text] A report from Alma-Ata: party conferences have been held in Aktyubinsk and North Kazakhstan Oblasts. They heard and debated reports by the oblast committees and auditing commissions and drew up programs for the future work of the oblast party organizations in intensifying perestroyka. The delegates discussed the draft platforms of the CPSU Central Committee and the Kazakhstan Communist Party Central Committee for the party congresses and the new CPSU Rules. The results of the elections of delegates to the 28th CPSU Congress and to the 27th Congress of Kazakhstan Communist Party, and the candidates for membership of the leading bodies of the CPSU, were examined. The authority of the members of the obkoms [oblast party committee] and auditing commissions were confirmed. Comrades Zolotarev and Medvedev were elected first secretary of the Aktyubinsk Oblast Party Committees and the North Kazakhstan Oblast Party Committee respectively. Nazarbayev, the president of the Kazakh Soviet Socialist Republic and first secretary of the Central Committee of the republic's Communist Party, spoke at the North Kazakhstan Oblast Party Committee conference.

Guryev Obkom First Secretary Released

LD0605130790 Alma-Ata Domestic Service in Kazakh 1400 GMT 5 May 90

[Text] A plenum of the Guryev Oblast Party Committee [obkom] was held. It examined an organizational matter: Kulibayev was released from his duties as first secretary of the oblast committee and buro member in connection with his transfer to another job.

The new first secretary of the oblast committee will be elected in the forthcoming party conference.

Taking part in the plenum's work was Anufriyev, second secretary of the Communist Party of Kazakhstan Central Committee, who also delivered a speech.